THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

LIBRARY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

B. C.

BS 511 .C48
Cheyne, T. K. (Thomas Kelly), 1841-1915.
Fresh voyages on unfrequented waters

THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

AGENTS

America . . The Macmillan Company
64 & 66 Fifth Avenue, New York

Australasia The Oxford University Press
205 Flinders Lane, Melbourne

Canada . . The Macmillan Company of Canada, Ltd.
St. Martin's House, 70 Bond Street, Toronto

India . . . Macmillan & Company, Ltd.
Macmillan Building, Bombay
309 Bow Bazaar Street, Calcutta

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/freshvoyagesonun0000tkch

AGENTS

America . . The Macmillan Company
64 & 66 Fifth Avenue, New York

Australasia The Oxford University Press
205 Flinders Lane, Melbourne

Canada . . The Macmillan Company of Canada, Ltd.
St. Martin's House, 70 Bond Street, Toronto

India . . . Macmillan & Company, Ltd.
Macmillan Building, Bombay
309 Bow Bazaar Street, Calcutta

FRESH VOYAGES

ON

UNFREQUENTED WATERS

BY

THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT.

HONORARY D.D. EDINBURGH AND GLASGOW
EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AT OXFORD
HONORARY FELLOW OF ORIEL AND WORCESTER COLLEGES
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1914

THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

FRESH VOYAGES

ON

UNFREQUENTED WATERS

BY

THE REV. T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT.

HONORARY D.D. EDINBURGH AND GLASGOW
EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AT OXFORD
HONORARY FELLOW OF ORIEL AND WORCESTER COLLEGES
FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

LONDON
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK
1914

I THOUGHT that my voyage had come to its end at the last limit of my power,—that the path before me was closed, that provisions were exhausted and the time come to take shelter in silent obscurity.

But I find that thy will knows no end in me; and when old words die on the tongue, new melodies break forth from the heart; and where the old tracks are lost, new country is revealed with its wonders.

(From *GITANJALI*, xxxvii.)

CONTENTS

PAGE

PROLOGUE xiii

PART I

OLD TESTAMENT, INCLUDING APOCRYPHA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY 1

CHAPTER II

HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH 7

CHAPTER III

EZRA 11

CHAPTER IV

NEHEMIAH 36

CHAPTER V

BOOK OF ESTHER 65

CHAPTER VI

BOOK OF JOB 70

CHAPTER VII

PAGE

Song of Solomon (?) 74

CHAPTER VIII

Proverbs and Ecclesiastes 78

CHAPTER IX

Book of Tobit 82

CHAPTER X

Book of Judith 105

CHAPTER XI

1 Maccabees 111

CHAPTER XII

Book of Daniel 114

CHAPTER XIII

1 Baruch 119

PART II

NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

Introductory 123

CHAPTER II

PAGE

NAZARETH AND ITS RELATED TRADITIONS; BETHLEHEM 136

CHAPTER III

MORE PLACE-NAMES—GETHSEMANE, GOLGOTHA, BETHANY, ETC. 142

CHAPTER IV

N.T. LISTS OF COUNTRIES OF THE DISPERSION . . 151

CHAPTER V

NAMES OF APOSTLES AND OTHERS (BARABBAS, BARNABAS, ETC.) 154

CHAPTER VI

APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN 167

INDEX 173

PROLOGUE

Rabindra Nath Tagore has aptly expressed my feelings when the pen did *not* fall from my hand (see *Veil*, p. 158) and new country invited my little ship to explore its wonders. I know that my opponents will think this an illusion, but years of sedulous quest of discoveries cannot have been spent on self-deceit, and my foes may by this time be beginning to ask whether they have not carried their opposition to undoubted originality much too far. The Indian poet gives thanks in 'new melodies' for not having been reduced 'to take shelter in silent obscurity.' There are, I also know, those who think it kindness to exhort me to silence. But they have hardly justified their exhortation to me by themselves entering on new tracks; the last ten years have not, so far as I am aware, produced a single brilliantly original work on the text and contents of the Old Testament emanating from the professional champions of so-called sobriety and moderation.

So much seemed necessary in a self-defence

which I hope is neither caustic nor too incisive for the occasion. Grave offence has been given, serious misunderstanding has been caused; slight attempt, if any, has been made to realize an unfamiliar point of view; of my opponents it may too truly be said that they are still 'moving about in worlds not realized.' And yet when they do take up the problems which I have made my own, they are almost or quite invariably baffled. In other words, they have not justified themselves for the hostile attitude that they have assumed towards me.

I regret to be unable to point to fresh aid received from inscriptions in writing this volume; the aid previously given has already been acknowledged in *Traditions and Beliefs* and (especially) *Mines of Isaiah*. Still, I may and must presume to say that fresh discoveries have been made by the adoption of the new textual point of view and by the new methods applied in the present series of books, and I will, in spite of infirmities, endeavour to sketch briefly the results of my recent 'voyages.'

The internal evidence supplied by the new school of prophets leaves it uncertain whether the conqueror of the N. Arabian city of Bābel took any direct part in facilitating the return of the

deported Jews. It is mainly states of mind which Second Isaiah describes; Third Isaiah, it is true, is somewhat more communicative, because he and his helpers evidently imply that the Jewish community at Jerusalem has been reorganized. The prologue to my *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* and my more recent *Mines of Isaiah* may be referred to here; indeed, a thorough study of the latter work is indispensable to those students who have shaken off old prejudices and wish to make trial of new methods. And to my mind this is the only worthy state of mind for a student. My friend Prof. Marti has given no answer to my question in *Mines of Isaiah*, chap. i., 'Shall we widen our point of view?'

The present work, therefore, may be looked upon as a continuation of earlier researches. It begins with Haggai and (the true) Zechariah, who lived subsequently to the reconstitution of the Jerusalem community, but before the asserted publication of the Tōrā by Ezra. It is worth while to mention in passing that the Jerusalem referred to by these prophets and by Second and Third Isaiah does appear to be the northern city of that name, and the same remark applies to the narratives of Ezra and Nehemiah. At the same time, we cannot be quite sure of this, because of the extent

to which text has been altered, and history been constructed on a basis of theory. There were two ideals respecting the site proper to the temple of Yahwè, according to one of which it ought to be rebuilt where Solomon is supposed to have built it, but according to the other in the N. Arabian borderland. The theory in vogue among some at least of the later Israelites was that the N. Arabian races would be united in one people with the Judaites under the 'great king over all the land'—Yahwè. The capital of this empire would, on religious grounds, be a place called 'Asshur-Yarḥam,' where a proclamation of the primitive Deuteronomic code had, under Josiah, been made, and at the same time a reformation movement inaugurated. No doubt the N. Arabian politicians regarded Judah as forming a province in itself, but it is probable that the goal of their ambition was analogous to that of the Hebrew prophets.[1] This accounts for the confidence with which ii. Isaiah refers to Kōresh as on Israel's side and for the singular statement in Mal. i. 11 :

. . . my name is great among the nations,
And in every place incense is offered to my name and a pure offering ;
For my name is great among the nations.

[1] *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 12, 39.

This clearly implies the theory of a united empire consisting of Judah and N. Arabia. The theory was but ill justified by facts, but the idealism deserves our sympathy. The physical background of Zechariah points, I think, to a residence in the N. Arabian borderland. Zerubbabel (Rab-Zebel), then, was not only 'governor of Judah' (Hag. ii. 21).

I have already mentioned the fortunate way in which the finds relating to the Jewish colony at Elephantiné have confirmed the most startling of my own views. In dealing with an important passage of Zechariah it had to be again referred to.

The student of Ezra and Nehemiah will find as much that calls for his respectful attention. Both books abound with ethnics and regionals, and there would seem to be more rather than fewer in consequence of my recent investigations. Prof. Marti, I learn, is much shocked at these results, which he accordingly rejects. *Amalim*, for instance, is unacceptable to him. He should, however, have been slower to commit himself. For not only have we 'the Asshurite Elam' in Ezra ii. 31, Neh. vii. 34, but also the hitherto unexplained reading of Neh. iv. 2, *amelalim*, under which it is difficult indeed not to see *amalim*.

In the Book of Esther I have at least been able to show that the atmosphere is, not Persian, but N. Arabian, and, further, that there is no occasion to have recourse for an explanation to Elamite mythology; the story being simply a symbolic description of the ancient feud between Yeraḥme'el (Haman) and Israel (Esther).

Upon the Book of Esther follows that of Job—strange yoke-fellows. No fresh light is thrown on the branch of literature to which this poem, with its prose prologue, and epilogue, belongs. The case for a N. Arabian background, however, is much strengthened by the restoration of the true text of Job iii. 5, 8, which shows that the Judaites were frequent visitors in Yeraḥme'elite[1] sanctuaries (cp. Isa. lxv., lxvi), and, one may add, in the reception-rooms of Yeraḥme'elite sages. It is hoped, too, that the æsthetic interest of several passages is heightened. Completeness, however, is not aimed at. Much work has been done on Job. As a rule the expositor of Job must be dependent on his predecessors.

On the Song of Solomon some fresh light is perhaps shed. At least it would be difficult to deny that the goddess Ashtart is referred to in ii. 7 and iii. 5, if the text may be corrected from

[1] See opening pages of Chap. VIII.

the point of view faintly adumbrated in chap. i. of *Mines of Isaiah* and the Prologue to *Critica Biblica*. The Song is therefore the work of some one who worshipped Ashtart — probably as a member of the Divine Triad—and who at the same time cherished a comparatively high conception of love. The fondness of the poet for gardens and for mountains is in harmony with this addiction to the N. Arabian goddess. There was much unfertile land in N. Arabia, in spite of irrigation. All the more may the N. Arabians have cared for plantations of flowering plants and trees. The æsthetic interest is also cared for by textual corrections.

In Chap. VIII. some fresh light is shed on the origin of the three great Hebrew wisdom books—Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. All these books were primarily inspired by the moral and religious philosophy of N. Arabia, as the headings of several *fasciculi* of the canonical proverbs, the names and origins of the interlocutors in Job, the great personification of Wisdom in Proverbs, and the epilogue to Ecclesiastes tell us plainly. Originally, wherever in Prov. viii. 12-31 Yahwè is spoken of, Yeraḥme'el was read. This, and not Yahwè, was the name of the directing, controlling, and creating God. It was He who formed those superhuman

Beings, the Messiah, the Logos, and Wisdom, the latter of whom is represented as uttering a fine monologue.

This remarkable utterance has been greatly misunderstood. In the original text Wisdom admitted her predilection for the N. Arabian peoples. This was all wiped out of the text by later editors, who thus made it possible for us, their spiritual descendants, to regard the personification itself as imported from Iran or from Babylon. Both hypotheses, however, are mistaken. The typical wise men, whom Israel put before itself as tutors and models (1 K. iv. 30 *f.*) were N. Arabians. How different, be it said anew in passing, must have been the simultaneously parallel conception of the great N. Arabian deity! May we not add, how different is the parallel conception of our own God!

In the Book of Tobit, narrative as it is, elements of 'wisdom' are not wanting, as indeed we might expect from the kinship of Tobit and Aḥiḳar. The main point brought out in the long chapter devoted to Tobit is the impossibility of any large Iranian element in the story or in its accessories. The name of the fiend Asmodæus (or Asmodaus?) in particular is not of Zoroastrian

origin, because of the inconsistency of the characteristics of the two figures, the one lustful, the other the impersonation of wrath, not to lay stress on the fact that Aêshma-daêva does not occur in our present Avestan texts (in the Later Avesta it does occur, according to Prof. Moulton). The details which make for a N. Arabian background cannot well be summarized. Possibly the most important is the correction of the text of Tobit iv. 17, which in its present form is so intolerable. It ought in candour to be added that, according to the author, Tobit iv. 6*b*-19*a* is extracted from a collection of wise utterances addressed to N. Arabians.

I have had so much pleasure, mingled doubtless with physical pain, that I am tempted to go on summarizing the rest of Part I. and the whole of Part II. in the way indicated in the preceding pages. I think, however, that, by the time the student has, under my guidance, reached the end of Tobit, he will cease to require this kind of assistance. He will also, I hope, by the time he has reached the end of Part I., see the necessity of applying the same methods to certain outlying fields of study in that vastly more important region—the New Testament. The results at which I have arrived may be called disillusion-

izing, but, when thoroughly grasped, supply a part at least of the material for a new House of Wisdom, which will better resist the assaults of the enemy.

OXFORD, *January* 1914.

PART I

OLD TESTAMENT, INCLUDING APOCRYPHA

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Professor Torrey of Yale has well-nigh revolutionized the study of Ezra and Nehemiah. I am afraid that the details of his argument and his incidental theories do not always commend themselves to me. But the fact remains that the supposed contemporaneous records of Ezra the scribe and Nehemiah the royal cup-bearer are largely imaginative; in a word, they are, regarded separately, only historical novels. The Chronicler, who finally shaped them, 'would doubtless have preferred to give freer rein to his imagination in composing the story of the Jews and their antecedents. But he was now writing not to interest, but with an apologetic purpose. The support of the recognized history was indispensable; outside this, it was important that he should confine himself to what was necessary. In the pre-exilic period, he could not well avoid incorporating at least a part of the well-known history of every king of Judah. In the post-exilic period, he

certainly seems to have made the most of the two documents which were available.'[1]

At the same time I would venture to point out that, though in their present state the Ezra and Nehemiah records are not to be called historical, there is another text behind the present, and that it is the critic's primary duty to search for this. The earlier form of Ezra-Nehemiah was, I presume, found by the Chronicler in the archives of Jerusalem. It consisted partly of lists of names, which, properly treated, are of great importance to the critic, and partly perhaps of narratives recast in such a way as to promote the orthodox view of Yahwè's religion. The treatment of the names in Ezr.-Neh. it has been my privilege to begin.

That this treatment is bound to have far-reaching consequences, I cannot wish to deny. Let us put our capacities for the work to a moderately easy test by a study of some passages of Haggai and Zechariah.

In a work most kindly mentioned by Professor Torrey, I explained myself thus (in 1908):

'Thus, our only authorities for the tone of the earliest post-exilic Judæan religion are the prophecies of Haggai and of the first or true Zechariah. Though devoid of literary charm, they are of much historical importance, because they stand on the dividing line between the exilic

[1] *Ezra Studies*, pp. 250 *f.*

and the post-exilic periods. It is a mistaken assertion that the post-exilic age begins with the so-called "edict of Cyrus" in B.C. 537. If there was a post-exilic age at all, it should rather be reckoned from the completion of the second temple in B.C. 516. For the true exile of the Jews was their sense of banishment from their God, and this painful consciousness began to be mitigated as soon as a house had been prepared for Jehovah to dwell in. "It is not time yet to build," said the people of the land, but the prophets believed the faith and hope which the effort of building the temple presupposed would exert a moral attraction upon Jehovah. At any moment after the coping had been laid the King of Glory might be expected to come in. Therefore I say that Haggai and Zechariah inaugurate the post-exilic period.'[1]

Two years later Professor C. C. Torrey published a different view in his very comprehensive work already referred to. He is of opinion that 'the exiles' are not (as most have supposed) the Judaites deported to Babylon, but the Israelites dispersed in many different countries. It is a misnomer to call the author of Isa. xl.-lxvi. the Prophet of the Exiles in Babylon; he is rather the Prophet of the Dispersion. Israelite theology, therefore, is legalistic in tendency, and 'even the noblest utterances of psalmist and "post-exilic"

[1] *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, pp. 11 *f.*

prophet are given a petty interpretation; so that instead of reaching the utmost horizon, as by their own wording they seem to do, they are made to cover only the smallest and unworthiest patch of human life and interest.'

Certainly 'post-exilic period' is a most unfortunate term, though not on the ground that 'exile' should mean 'dispersion'; a better reason would be that the later Israelitic literature presents such varied tendencies that 'post-exilic' ceases to have any very distinctive meaning. It must, however, be admitted that the text even of the most admired passages is not by any means as free from doubt as could be wished. Let us consider some of these doubtful passages. If we cannot illuminate these, it may be a sign that we have gone astray, or that we have but a moderate turn for such inquiries. I much fear that many scholars will think that I at least have gone very far astray. But 'One is He that knoweth, the Compassionate,' is the burden of my song. If I possess the 'bright and morning star,' why should I take the dullness of my critics to heart?

CHAPTER II

HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH

I BEGIN with the truly illuminative study (see Introduction) of Haggai and the true Zechariah.

Hag. i. 14, ii. 23; Zech. iv. 14. The form Zerubbabel is incorrect and misleading. We shall see later (p. 18) that it is due to the imperfect knowledge of history possessed by the scribes who revised the traditional text. The right form, I venture to say, is ʿArāb-Zebel, *i.e.* Arabia of Ishmael.[1] It was in N. Arabia that the exiles (or, as Torrey would say, the emigrants) of Israel referred to in the extant prophecies were settled, and it is the N. Arabian Babel (corrupted from Rakbul?[2]) from which Ṣion is called upon (in Zech. ii. 11) to escape.[3] It may be mentioned that the 'sons of oil' in Zech. iv. 14 should perhaps rather be 'sons of Iṣhar,' *i.e.* 'sons of Ashḥur.' The reference seems to be to Zerub-

[1] The latest theory concerning זרבבל is that of Prof. J. D. Prince (*JBL*, 1913, p. 151), who explains as 'treasure,' but most unsatisfactorily.

[2] *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 135*f.* Rakbul was the name both of a place and of a god.

[3] *Decline and Fall*, p. 57.

babel and Joshua. It is an interesting fact that the Chronicler (1 Chr. iv. 7) gives *Yiṣhar* among the sons of Ashḥur; Yiṣhar (Izhar) is of course a corruption of Ashḥur.

Zech. ii. 10, v. 11. Ṣaphon is a remote N. Arabian district or region,[1] and in Zech. ii. 12 the interrupting words should be read אַשְׁחֵר רכבול ש׳. 'He hath sent me to Ashḥur of Rakbul,' a gloss on שלחני, 'he hath sent me,' at the end of *v.* 13. Ashḥur-Rakbul is one of the names for the land of Israel's captivity (Torrey would say, dispersion). Another name for it (Zech. v. 11) was Shinar, which means not Babylonia, but Ishmael of Arabia; strictly, Ishman-'Arāb. See *T. and B.* on Gen. x. 10. The prophet was sent (see gloss in *v.* 13) to the land of captivity with glad tidings.

The references to trees and mountains may also require re-examination. The הדסים of Zech. i. 8-11 are not myrtle-trees, but some undefinable tree which grew in the mountains, one of those called Asshur-trees.[2] As for the mountains, 'mountains of brass' cannot be right. What can it reasonably mean? A mythological explanation would be the resource of despair. In Gen. iv. 22[3] נחשת and in 2 K. xviii. 4 נחשתן may suggest an explanation, for it has been shown to be almost or quite certain that both these words come from חשתן, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Ethan. It appears that there

[1] *Mines of Isaiah*, II, 181, 183.

[2] See *Decline and Fall*, pp. 113 *f.*

[3] *T. and B.* p. 109.

was a certain N. Arabian district in which two conspicuous mountains specially challenged attention. In iv. 7 הר הגדול should no doubt rather be הר הגלעד, 'mount of Gilead.' Here, as often, it is the southern Gilead that is meant.

The personal names have also a claim to be considered. Zerubbabel indeed has been explained already. Tobîah (Zech. vi. 10) is not 'goodness of Yahu,' a name which was borne (to Nöldeke's surprise)[1] by an Ammonite (Neh. ii. 10), but comes from Tubal-Yarḥu,—in other words, is primarily a compound regional. In vi. 14, Ḥen (a singular name) probably comes from Ḥanōk, a N. Arabian clan-name.[2] The visitors come from *Babel.*

Another curious combination of personal names is 'Beth-el, Ṡarezer, and Regem-melek' (vii. 2). Three views deserve mention. Two of these presuppose the strict accuracy of the form Beth-el. Indeed, there is no doubt that Bîtili-nuri occurs as the name of a Babylonian on a tablet of the age of Artaxerxes I., and that Beth-el was the name of one of the gods worshipped by the Jews at Elephantinê.[3] There is no question, too, that 'Bît-ili' may have been a divine name among the Babylonians, strange as such an use may be.[4] The third view is that of the present writer. It is

[1] *Zt. für Assyriologie*, 1907, p. 204, quoted by Torrey.

[2] *Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 51 *f.*

[3] *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 110, 113 *ff.*

[4] *KAT*(3), p. 435 (top). *Bît-ili* has the determinative of deity.

that Beth-el comes from Yithba'al, *i.e.* Ishba'al, or Ishma'al, which the Jews seem to have used both as a divine name and as a regional. That this view is correct, seems to the writer certain. Render therefore the passage which has baffled so many:

'And Yithba'al-Śar'eṣer and Magar[1]-Rakmal sent their men to propitiate Yahwè.'

The other names need not delay us long. Śar and 'Ezer are presumably old clan-names; Magar is a more probable form than Regem, because it explains Mag in Rab-Mag; Melek is a corruption of Rakmal. The upshot of the story is that three Jewish clans, of N. Arabian affinities, sent representatives to the temple to make inquiries at the fountain-head of legal knowledge.

In revising these pages I feel it necessary to repeat that Nehemiah's Tobiah was an Ammonite, to which there is a variant 'Arabian.'[2] In Josh. xviii. 23 *f.*, next to Ophrah is a Benjamite town called Kefar-ha'ammonai, which is usually explained 'the Ammonite villages'; really, however, Ammonai is a corruption of Aḥimani, and Kefar of Akrab. Akrab-Aḥimani is the name of one of the Akrabs, situated in N. Arabia. Now perhaps we see better how Ammonite and Arabian can be equivalent.[3]

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 157.

[2] See on Neh. ii. 10, and cp. *Jewish Rel. Life after the Exile*, at end.

[3] See *The Veil*, pp. 16 *f.* (note 1, end).

CHAPTER III

EZRA

CHAP. i. 1. I venture to begin with a question. Is it likely that a Jewish writer would have represented Cyrus, king of Persia, as saying, 'Yahwè, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth'? This must be taken in connexion with passages like Isa. xli. 2, xlv. 4, 13; Jer. xxv. 9, xxvii. 6, xliii. 10; Dan. iii. 28 *f.*, iv. 2-37, vi. 25-27. In all these passages Cyrus, king of Persia, or Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, is (according to the traditional view of the text) represented as standing in a relation of intimacy (whether actual or prospective) to the God of the Jews. Except in writings which can be shown to present sufficiently clear traces of the Hellenizing spirit, such a view of the relation of Yahwè to distant non-Israelitish empire-builders is most improbable. There is a large amount of evidence for the view that כרש מלך פרס has come out of אַשְׁחֵר מלך פתרס[1], where פתרס, or rather ספרת (Neh. vii. 57, cp. Ezr. ii. 55), has

[1] See *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 126 *f.*

come from צרפת, a N. Arabian name, attaching most probably to more than one city and region (cp. on Ezek. xxvii. 10). On 'Nebuchadrezzar' it is needless to speak here.[1] Of course הארץ must now be rendered 'of the land,' *i.e.* of N. Arabia, towards S. Palestine. Note that 1 Esdr. iv. 42–v. 6 makes the royal liberator of the Jews not Cyrus but Darius (cp. below on Dan. vi. 1).

2. If this be adopted, we have to ask next whether the king of Pathros (let us call the name so conventionally) would be represented as having called Yahwè 'the god of heaven.' Shortly afterwards the royal speaker says, 'his God be with him'; the king, then, called his own supreme God by another name. To reply that, to please the Persian worshippers of a supreme heaven-God, the Jews represented their God as a 'God of heaven,'[2] adding (with Meyer, *Entst.* p. 49, but cp. Cooke, *N. Arab. Inscr.* pp. 45 *f.*), 'there were many such in Syria and elsewhere,' is plainly inadequate. Nor would it suffice to say that the phrase 'the God of heaven' occurs in other passages, in some of which it clearly means 'the God who made and in some sense dwells in heaven' (viz. in Neh. i. 4 *f.*, ii. 4, 20; Dan. ii. 18, 19, 44, cp. 28; Jon. i. 9; Ps. cxxxvi. 26). For in i. 2, at any rate, and in vi. 9 *f.*, vii.

[1] See *Decline and Fall*, p. 57.

[2] Cp. the phrases 'the king of heaven' (Dan. iv. 37; 1 Esdr. iv. 46, 58; Tobit xiii. 7, 11); 'the Lord of heaven' (Dan. v. 23); 'the Lord of heaven and earth' (Tobit vii. 18).

12, 21, 23, the phrase must represent some title of Yahwè which was not merely shared by other Syrian deities, but was, from a non-Jewish point of view, distinctive. And the same remark applies, I think, to v. 12. 'The God of heaven' (אלה שמיא) must then be interpreted by vi. 9 *f.*, where the same phrase must represent a name distinctive to Darius of the God of the Jews, so that when, in v. 11, we read, 'We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth,' 'and earth' (וארעא) must be redactional; a Greek translator (1 Esdr. vi. 12) paraphrases, 'of the Lord who made (τοῦ κτίσαντος) heaven and earth.' What, then, is the name which may underlie שמים and שמיא? There can be no doubt; it is something equivalent to ישמ (Ishman = Ishmael). שמים (שמי), like שמן and שם, שמש and שש,[1] has come from this well-known and therefore often corrupted name; cp. on Gen. xi. 4, xlix. 25; Judg. v. 20; Ps. lxxxix. 6, 12. The title 'God of Ishmael' (or 'of Yeraḥme'el') is attested by the (probably) true text of Gen. xxi. 33 and xxiv. 7 (see *T. and B.*); also by the divine names given as Phœnician by Philo of Byblus, and the former well known from Phœnician inscriptions,[2]

[1] See *T. and B.* p. 488 (n. 2).

[2] For the passages see Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, Index. One may notice here that שמם אדרם in Eshmunazar's inscription (*ll.* 16 *f.*), and שמם רמם in the inscription of Bod-astart, Eshmunazar's grandson (*l.* 3), both represent the same place-name, which originally must have meant 'Ishmael-arām.'

Βεελσαμην and Σαμημροῦμος, *i.e.* 'Baal of Ishmael' and 'Ishmael[-Yeraḥme'el]'; and, let me add, with much confidence, the שקוץ שמם of Dan. xii. 11, etc., which is not a distortion of בעל שמם (Nestle, *ZATW*, 1884, p. 248; my own *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 105; and Bevan, *Daniel*, p. 193), but means 'idol of Ishmael.' When the old Hebrew texts were revised, such a phrase as 'God of Ishmael' would have been unpalatable, even if intelligible. The phrase 'God of heaven' was an obvious substitute.[1] I shall return to this in our study of the Book of Daniel.

3. In i. 3 another doubt occurs. That a gloss has intruded, is pointed out by Guthe. To admitting such a gloss however, as 'he is the deity who is in Jerusalem,' there are cogent objections which are well stated by Ryle. But what would the shorter gloss, הוא האלהים, mean? Is it merely an assertion of the divinity of Yahwè? Surely not. It is probable that אלהים and האלהים have often arisen, under the pressure of later theology, out of some shortened form of ירחמאל (see on Gen. xvi. 7, xxxi. 11; Ex. iii. 1). Suppose this to be so here. We are then liberated from the necessity of supposing what Ryle has truly called a 'reverent but awkward' gloss. הוא ירחם' will mean, 'that is, Yeraḥme'el,' and be a gloss on ישמעאל in the phrase אלהי ישמ' (see above). The

[1] It is remarkable that in 1 Esdr. vi. 28 we find τῷ κυρίῳ Ζοροβαβελ where MT. (vi. 9) has לאלה שמיא.

THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

The King's Library

gloss, as glosses often did, got into the text at an unsuitable place.

4. Plausible as the current Persian explanation of 'Mithredath' (i. 8) may be, it falls with the supposed Persian explanation of 'Koresh' and other names. It should be noted that in iv. 7 the same name stands between 'Bishlam' and 'Tab'el,' which no ingenuity can represent as Persian. We can hardly venture to separate the name from מטרד in Gen. xxxvi. 39, where the right reading is מתודד, Methudad, *i.e.* Temuldad (= Ethmaal-Hadad). Cp. also מטרי, a gentilic in 1 S. x. 21, which points indubitably to N. Arabia (see *Crit. Bib.*).

5. Not less plausible, and yet not less incorrect, are the new explanations of 'Sheshbazzar' as = Bab. Šamaš-bil (or -bal?) -uṣur (van Hoonacker), or Šamaš-nâṣir (Winckler). Several of the Greek forms are nearer to the most probable original, *e.g.* σαναμασσαρος, σαμανασσαρος [σα]σαβαλασσαρος, all of which point back to, not Sin-bal-uṣur (Haupt), but יִשְׁמַנְאֶשֶׁר. Cp. שנאצר (1 Chr. iii. 18), from ישמן אשר. Shenazzar and Sheshbazzar are one and the same person (Howorth, Kosters, Ed. Meyer, Marquart, Winckler). See *E. Bib.*, 'Shenazzar.'

6. An objection may well be taken to משנים in i. 10. Why, pray, should there be 'silver bowls of a second sort' (Eng. Bible, after Rashi) when the narrative mentions none of a superior

quality? The Greek of 1 Esdr. ii. 10 (12) presupposes אַלְפַּיִם (δισχίλιοι). Guthe finds it hard to say whether this number can really have stood in the text, as 'the numbers in *vv.* 9-11 of MT. in general vary from those in 1 Esdr. ii. 9 *ff.* (12 *ff.*).' Surely משנים is transparent enough to the practised eye. Again and again we have found that משנ֗ represents ישמן; see the testing passages, Gen. xli. 43, 1 S. xv. 19, 2 K. xxii. 14, Zeph. i. 10.[1] The אלפים of 1 Esdr. may not impossibly have a similar origin. אלף sometimes probably represents מאל[ירח]; see *e.g.* Josh. xviii. 28 (אלף, between צלע and [י]יבוס, both from ישמעאל), and *v.* 27 (ירפאל, between רקם and תראלה). There may well have been two equivalent readings, 'Ishmaelite' and 'Yeraḥme'elite.' That silver came from Arabia, appears from 2 S. viii. 10-12, Jer. x. 9, and Ezek. xxvii. 12 (rightly interpreted). See *E. Bib.*, 'Silver,' § 2. On the 'missing conclusion of Ezra i.' see Torrey, *JBL*, xvi. (1897), pp. 168-170; cp. *Ezra Studies.*

Chap. ii. See on Neh. vii. 6-73*a*.

Chap. iii. 1. ובני ישר׳ בערים (*v.* 1), 'the Israelites being in the cities,' or בעריהם, 'in their cities' (Neh. vii. 73*b*). What an awkward parenthesis! In 1 K. iv. 13, ערים comes from ערבים, just as עיר often comes from ערב. The seeming circumstantial clause is a gloss, which has intruded

[1] *T. and B.* p. 466; *D. and F.*, Introd. p. xlv, and p. 18; *Two Religions*, p. 409.

most inappropriately here. Render, 'that is, the Israelites in Arabia.' See below.

2. אימה עליהם [or, 1 Esdr., איבה] כי, 'for terror (or, hostility) was upon them.' How can this be right? Leaving the discussion of what may underlie the Greek of 1 Esdr. v. 49 (50) to Klostermann, Guthe, and Torrey, I would express the fear that these scholars have not sufficiently criticized the troublesome word איבה or אימה. From the old point of view and with only the old methods this word in such a context presents an insoluble problem. But experience of new methods, joined to a new point of view, has altered all this. In the Psalms איב constantly represents ערב, and on the analogy of this אים might supplant ארם. In the passage before us it is almost certain that we should read כי עמלים הֵם or כי ערבים הֵם, 'Truly they are Amalim,' or 'Arabian.' Amalim is another form of Yeraḥme'elim (see *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 41, 45). For Torrey's too balanced opinion, see his *Comp. and Hist. Value of Ezra-Neh.* pp. 12 *f.* (note 2).

3. It is a difficulty in the received view of iii. 7 that, according to Herod. iii. 34, Phœnicia was not subject to Cyrus. The new view, however, is unobjectionable, and makes a plausible sense. For observe that here, as often, ים represents יָמָן, the name of a Yeraḥme'elite region. צדן and צר both represent N. Arabian places, viz. צדקן and מצר; see Joel iv. 4, where צר וצידון is parallel to 'Pelesheth,' or rather 'Ethbal' = Yeraḥme'elites,

or N. Arabians (*The Veil*, pp. 13 *ff.*). The place meant is probably מִצַּר (see *Crit. Bib.*, Josh. xi. 8). Need I repeat that לבן is a *southern* name, and that לבנון may well have been an old name of N. Arabian mountains? It is worth adding that in Ezek. xxxi. 'Lebanon' and 'Miṣrim' are brought close together.

Chap. iv. 1. If the original now commonly assigned to 'Zerubbabel,' viz. Zer-babili, is really a contraction of Marduk-zâru-Babili-lišir, 'Marduk preserves the seed [heir] to Babylon,' it is surely not a very judiciously chosen name for a governor appointed by Persia. But if Ezra-Neh. and the early part of Daniel refer to a N. Arabian captivity and to its termination, another explanation becomes irresistible, viz. רב־זבל, 'chief of Ishmael' (see on Judg. ix. 28); cp. רב־סרים and רב־שקה, from רב־אשור and רב־אֶשְׂחַר respectively. Most certainly, however, רב is an abbreviation of עֶרֶב. It is quite possible that later readers explained the misreading זרבבל as 'sown in Bâbel.' The name of the governor's father *appears* to mean 'I have asked of God.' But *really* שאלתיאל comes from אשתאלי (1 Chr. ii. 53). On the other names see elsewhere in the series of my works on these problems.

2. In *vv.* 5, 6, 7, 9, five royal names occur. The first, כורש, has been already explained; it is = Ashkor (Ashkar). The second, דריוש, may come either from דד אשור or from אשדר = אשור דוד; the

third, אחשורוש, from אשחור; the fourth, ארתחששתא, from אשחר doubled; the fifth, אסנפר, from אסנ = ישמעאל (cp. on אסנת, Gen. xli. 45) and פר or בר (*i.e.* 'Ishmael of Arabia'). Whether these royal names are all, or even any of them, genuine, it is unfortunately beyond our power to determine. It is equally regrettable that several of these can easily be confounded. Cp. on Esth. i. 1.

3. Are critics satisfied with any of the current explanations of בשלם (*v.* 7)? That שלם is probably either from ישמעאל or from שלמה, should be obvious. The initial ב is as clearly a fragment, not, however, of בן, but of ערב (see *T. and B.* on בצלאל, Ex. xxxi. 1); cp. on בלשן, Neh. vii. 7 (Ezra ii. 2).

4. טבאל, doubtless, may be plausibly explained as 'God is good' (or 'wise'). But if 'Bishlam' and 'Mithredath' point to N. Arabia, must we not explain טבאל (as in Isa. vii. 6) as = Tubal? Cp. Shobal, also Ethbaal, and see *E. Bib.*, 'Tabeel.' And must we not further suppose that, however 'Rehum' may have been *conventionally* explained, it was a N. Arabian name, connected with ירחם, and that 'Shimshai' is a popular distortion of ישמעאלי?

5. Next as to the troublesome names of peoples (*v.* 9). The sixth is 'Bablites,' the ninth 'Elamites.' These at any rate we *seem* to understand, though their introduction is rather puzzling. But what of the first five? For four of these, says Meyer (*Entst.* pp. 37 *f.*), 'all interpreters have taken much vain trouble to hunt up

an acceptable meaning.' And these four stand at the head of the roll! I wish I could say more about them. But I can say, with regard not only to them, but to all the names in *v.* 9, that they support the view that the scene of the original narrative was in N. Arabia. I am aware that while 2 Esdr. iv. 9 agrees with MT. in taking all the words which follow כנותהון as names of peoples (though Luc. gives *οἱ κριταί* where MT. has דִּינָיֵא), 1 Esdr. ii. 16 (17) has *καὶ κριταί* (A, *κραταιοί*), and continues *οἱ ἐν κοίλῃ Συρίᾳ καὶ Φοινίκῃ*; also that Ed. Meyer (p. 40), partly following G. Hoffmann, would read, 'the Persian judges, the Persian *ṭarpelayyā*.' But surely the following words 'and the rest of the peoples' require us to interpret all the words between כנ׳ and ושאר (and not merely a part of them) as ethnics. Evidently *v.* 9 is a compilation. What, then, is דיניא? It must be the name of some important people, but of what? In 2 K. xix. 12, we read of the 'b'nê 'Eden who (were) in Tel-assar.' Now Tel-assar (see *Crit. Bib.*, *ad loc.*) represents 'Tubal-asshur.' The race was 'destroyed,' we are told; but that is a relative term. Another form of עדן was עדין (ii. 15); perhaps we may compare דינה (Gen. xxx. 21). An obscure name Din-Šarru (near Susa) will hardly, except under compulsion, be preferred.—אפרסתניא must, of course, be taken with אפרסיא (which follows presently) and אפרסניא (v. 6, vi. 6). In all these, Meyer (p. 38) remarks,

the consonants of פרס (*i.e.*, as he thinks, 'Persia') are inclosed. It may seem a little strange to hear of 'the Persians in Abar-naharâ,' but this may mean, as he suggests, 'the Persians settled in Abar-naharâ.'[1] For the second of these forms, however, Marquart (*Fund.* p. 64) would read סְפָרְיָא. Both these suggestions contain a germ of truth—even the latter, which presupposes the wrong view that some of the words in the list are official designations. The correct solution of the problem, however, is that suggested by the N. Arabian hypothesis. פרס, ספר (cp. קרית ספר), and פתרס are all much-worn fragments of צרפת, and hence all the three forms mentioned above may represent צרפתיא, 'Zarephathites.' (The כ in the first form is a scribe's error.)—And what as to טרפליא? Rawlinson proposes 'Tuplai' as the original. The sense would be good, but the form תפל is opposed by the name טבאל. Its more plausible original is אשתרבליא, 'Ashtarbelites.' For טר cp. אטר, p. 52; and for פל cp. אמרפל. — ארכווי, בבליא. *T. and B.* on Gen. x. 10.—שושנכיא. From אשור-צבניא; cp. Shethar-Bozenai; נה from בנ. — דהוא. Rather (as G. Hoffm., etc.), די-הוא, 'that is'; 2 Esdr. *οἱ εἰσίν*.—עלמיא. See on Gen. x. 22 (עילם). The Assyrian inscriptions say nothing of a deportation of 'Elamites.'

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Cœlesyria.' The region called in 1 Esdr. ii. 21, vi. 3, 7, 26, Syria and Phœnicia, and in 1 Esdr. ii. 16, 20, vii. 1, viii. 64 (cod. A), Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia. See, however, note 7

6. Winckler (*KAT*, p. 297 ; *AOF*, 2nd ser., iii. 461 *b*, 465) rejects the statement that the opponents of the Jews were Moabites, Ammonites, and 'Samaritans,' and regards the passage (*vv.* 9-11) which includes the reference to 'the city of Samaria' as a late insertion dictated by the later hatred of the Sam. sect. This bold step is unnecessary. It is true, Samaria and the Samaritans have no business here. But the text has been misread. 'In the city (2 Esdr., cities) of Samaria' should be 'in the city (cities) of Shimron.' The colonists settled in the border-land, which had once been Israelitish, had good reason to fear the aggression of the new community of Jerusalem. Cp. on 2 K. xvii. 24.

7. 'And (in) the rest of the *'abar nahará.*' 'Abar naharâ, of course, may mean the Persian province of Syria (so Meyer, p. 20). There is, however, no necessity for this. 1 Kings v. 4 is not proved by the occurrence of עבר הנהר to have been written in the Persian period ; the נהר may have been a southern, not a northern stream (cp. Winckler, *GI*, ii. 264 ; *KAT*$^{(3)}$, p. 148). So too it may have been here ; the whole context points, as is here shown, in this direction. As in 1 Kings v. 4, the נהר may have been, and probably was, the ירחון sometimes to be suspected underneath the ירדן of the narrative books (see *The Veil of Hebrew History*, p. 3), In iv. 17 שלם *may* perfectly well have come from ישמעאל—a gloss on עבר נהרא.

8. מלח היכלא מלחנא (*v.* 14) is a trouble to the critics; how can מלחנא mean 'we eat salt'? Nestle (*Marg.* p. 31) expresses my own feeling of what is required. 'I believe that מלחנא is a substantive with suffix. The passage means, "because the *x* of the temple or palace is our *x*." But I cannot yet frame any explanation, and, so far as I know, the cuneiform inscriptions throw no light on the passage.' Surely היכלא is a scribe's production out of a half-illegible ירחמאל (cp. on Neh. iii. 7), and מלח has come from מִלֶּךְ. Read מלך ירח' מלכָּנָא, 'the king of Yeraḥme'el is our king.'

9. שלם may no doubt be an epistolary formula (= *χαίρειν*); cp. *v.* 7, Dan. iii. 31, vi. 26. But this is not certain. It may (like משאל and משלם, also אבשלום) represent ישמעאל, which would be a gloss on עבר נהרא. גמיר, vii. 12, is partly parallel.

Chap. v. 1. In *v.* 3 we meet with a governor of '*Abar-nahará* called תתני. If this be Persian, we may choose between Thithina and Vištana (see *E. Bib.*, 'Tatnai'), but we shall hardly be quite satisfied. The forms *Ταυθαναιος*, *Ταυθαναι*, *Θαυαναι* favour תנחני. This may point to אתני, which in 1 Chr. vi. 26 is pointed אֶתְנִי, but is perhaps rather אִיתָנִי = אֵתָנִי. 'Ethani' was an important ethnic (see *E. Bib.*, *s.v.*) derived from Ethmani.

2. שתר בוזני. A plausible Persian original is wanting. שתר, however, ought not to be obscure.

It is clearly אשתרי (or—ע?), *i.e.* a man of Ashtar (a synonym of Ashḥur and Asshur). Cp. שתר, Esth. i. 14, one of the 'seven princes' at the court of king 'Ahasuerus,' *i.e.* Ashḥur; also תרש, Esth. ii. 21, vi. 2, a *sārīs*; and תרשיש (*E. Bib.*, 'Tarshish'). בוזני is just as clear. בוז (cp. בעז) is ultimately a corruption of ישמעאל; see on Gen. xxii. 21. The links between בוזני and ישמעאלי are שמעני and צבעני (see on 'Ṣibeon,' Gen. xxxvi. 2, 20). Was this person the secretary (Marq., p. 52)?

3. 'Koresh, king of Bābel' (*v.* 13; cp. Neh. xiii. 6). The title might equally well be assumed by Persian and by Asshurite or 'Pathrosite' kings. In the one case בבל, in the other perhaps רכבל, is the name of the city which they conquered. Cp. on vi. 22, vii. 12.

4. Has a name fallen out? Klost. reads, לזרבבל ש' שמה, taking Sheshbazzar to be the official name. Cp. Dan. iv. 16.

Chap. vi. 1. אחמתא (*v.* 2), *i.e.* the southern Ḥamath. In Isa. xi. 11 this important place is mentioned after שנער (see on Gen. x. 10, xi. 1-9). It was also, as appears from our passage rightly read, in the province of מדי (see on Gen. x. 2). In 2 K. xxiii. 33, xxv. 21, we read of 'the land of Hamath.' It bordered on Israelitish territory (1 K. viii. 65).

2. 'King of Asshur' (*v.* 22), not inconsistent with 'king of Bābel' (*v.* 13). The kingdom of

'Asshur' or 'Pathros' (Pārās) included Bābel. Cp. on v. 13.

CHAP. vii. 1. Can we really acquiesce in the cheap and here most unsatisfactory expedient of an alteration in the points of יְסַד (יִסַּד) in *v.* 9? Surely יסד הוא must be a gloss, and as surely יסד is corrupt. J. Derenbourg (*Journ. asiat.*, Oct. 1866) proposes to read נְרֻם, *i.e.* Nuruz, the name of a Persian festival kept on the first day of the first month of the year, which with the Persians, as with the Jews of Ezra's time, began with the vernal equinox. The festival is referred to in the Talmud (see Jastrow's *Lex.*, *s.v.* נרוס). Cp. Kremer, *Mittelsyrien*, p. 127. Should we not rather read נִיסָן (cp. Neh. ii. 1)?

2. מלך מלכיא (*v.* 12). The title 'king of kings' occurs often, though not always, in the inscriptions of the Achæmenidæ. If this document was either written or edited as a firman from the Persian court the reading is unobjectionable, If, however, it was originally written as (in pretence) a N. Arabian document, it is obviously more appropriate to read מלך ירחמאל, מלך and מלכי being corruptions of ירחמאל. The same correction may be called for in Ezek. xxvi. 7, but hardly in Dan. ii. 37 in its present form. Cp. on מלח היכלא, iv. 14.

3. גמיר, 'completed,' is strange. It is usual now to explain '*et cetera*.' 1 Esdr. viii. 13 gives *χαίρειν*, as if גמיר were equivalent to שלם ('peace'); 2 Esdr. vii. 21, *τετέλεστο ὁ λόγος*. It may, how-

ever, be compared with גמר, Gen. x. 2, and come from חמיר, *i.e.* ירחם; 'Yarḥam' (Yeraḥme'el) would be a gloss on שמיא, which is thus explained to mean 'Ishmael' (cp. on אלהי השמים, i. 2).

4. 'His own counsellors' (*v.* 14). Are critics quite satisfied with quoting this passage and Esth. i. 14 as a proof that the Persian king had seven privy councillors (so, *e.g.*, Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des Alt.* iii. p. 43)? Had the number seven no sacredness in N. Arabia? Were the seven planets known in Babylonia and not in Arabia?

5. In *v.* 25 is not the most natural meaning this—that all the people in 'Abar-naharâ are to be judged in accordance with the religious law-book which Ezra carries with him, and that those who, not being Jews, are unacquainted with the usage (משפט) of the cult of Yahwè are to be taught it? Parallel: 2 K. xvii. 25-28. The 'Abar-naharâ is, I take it, not the great satrapy including (as is generally held) Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, but the region beyond the naḥal Miṣrim or the nĕhar Perâth (Ephrath), from the point of view of a N. Arabian king. שרשו (*v.* 26) is therefore to be explained as expatriation (cp. שֹׁרֶשׁ, Ps. lii. 7), not exclusion from the Jewish community (as Ryssel, comparing x. 8).

Chap. viii. 1. *Vv.* 1-14 profess to give a register of the heads of *gentes* who accompanied Ezra. The majority of the names certainly, and all of them very probably, are such as would be

borne by persons of N. Arabian affinities. Naturally enough if, as Torrey holds, the author of the so-called Memoirs of Ezra is—the Chronicler.

It will be enough here to explain the following names; cp. Neh. vii. 6-73*a*. (*a*) חטוש; cp. תחש, Gen. xxii. 24, a son of ראומה, a name which is a corruption of ירחמ'. Both ח' and ת' may be corruptions of אחשתר (see on 1 Chr. iv. 6), a modification of אשחר, facilitated by the parallel form אשתר. (*b*) שבניה = שכניה, which is to be grouped with שבנא or שבנה (the well-known Shebna, who was a N. Arabian adventurer), and אשבן (Gen. xxxvi. 26), both which names come either from שבן = שמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל, or from בשן = ערב ישמעאל (see *T. and B.* p. 571). (*c*) פרעש, like פשחור (a priestly name), which comes from ערב־אשחור, may be safely traced to ערב־אשור. (*d*) פחת מואב. פחת represents נפתוח = תפוח; cp. נפתחים, Gen. x. 13. (*e*) אליהועיני. A form, conventionalized religiously, of ירחמאל; cp. עליון, Gen. xiv. 18, and עלון, Gen. xxvi. 23, both from some form of ירחמאל. Cp. x. 22, where 'Elienai' occurs in combination with 'Maaseiah' (a name which includes a shortened form of 'Ishmael') and 'Ishmael.' In Chr. iv. 46 'Elienai' occurs beside 'Yaakobah' (from 'Aḥ'ab') in a Simeonite genealogy. (*f*) עתליה. Plausible as an Assyriological explanation may be (see *E. Bib.*, 'Athaliah'), a N. Arabian one is at any rate not less tenable. The original of עתלי (cp. x. 28) is

probably אֶשְׁתָּאלִי. (*g*) עזגד, probably from עזור-גד, 'Gadite Azzur.' (*h*) קטן[ה], from אשחר-איתן (cp. on 'Yoktan,' Gen. x. 25). (*i*) אדניקם, probably from עדן ירחם (cp. on 'Adonijah,' 2 S. iii. 4). אחרנים[ה] follows, on which Guthe makes this remark, 'We have in this word either a corruption of the text, or an otherwise unknown technical term referring to the genealogical registers.' Siegfried, 'The addition אח introduces the following names as belonging to a later development of the family.' Ryssel frankly confesses, 'What caused this designation, we cannot tell.' Yet, if their critical methods had not been so narrow, these learned scholars would not have been driven to such straits. The case is nearly or quite parallel to that of נבו אחר, Neh. vii. 33, and עילם אחר, Ezra ii. 31, Neh. vii. 34, where אחר represents undoubtedly אשחר. Cp. also האחרנים, 2 S. xxiii. 1. 'Eliphelet,' 'Yeuel,' and 'Shemaiah' are all found in Chron., and proved by critical inspection of the names and of those near which they occur to be N. Arabian. The clan of 'Adonikam,' therefore, was not merely Ashḥurite by name (this would be unknown), but Ashḥurite by residence, if not also by immediate descent.

Vv. 15-30 describe the assembling of Ezra's company near a certain stream. We have carefully to examine the name of the river; it is 'the river that goes to Ahava' (*v.* 15), also 'the

stream Ahava' (*vv.* 21, 31). It is generally assumed by critics that one of the more important canals of the Euphrates is meant. But we have first to get the best reading. Such forms[1] as *ενειμ εεια, αουε,* do not help us any further; *θουε* and [δ]*αουαθ* help us by suggesting that a ת should be restored; *ενειμ* suggests a ם, and *θερα*[*ν*] a ר; while *τοῖς νεανίσκοις* (1 Esdr. viii. 49) probably represents אל־הנערים. The most important of these forms are obviously *θερα* and *τοῖς νεανίσκοις*. The former suggests an original ארת, *i.e.* אפרת; the latter, אל־הנ' ערים, where הנ' = הנהר, and ערים may come from ערבים, will suit here. The נַחַל עֲרָב (so read for נחל ערבה) is referred to in Am. vi. 14. The נהר [א]פרת also occurs often (see on Gen. ii. 14, xv. 18; Jer. xiii. 4 *ff.*). One of the southern border-streams (sometimes called אחרא) is most probably meant. There was a Jewish settlement beside the stream called 'Chebar' in Ezekiel's time (Ezek. i. 1 etc.), and from 2 K. xvii. 6, xviii. 11 (= 1 Chr. v. 26) there appear to have been Israelitish exiles beside the 'stream of Gozan' called Ḥabor.[2] It is probable that 'Ḥabor' and 'Chebar' ('Kebar') are really the

[1] For the Biblical sources of the names, see the Heb. Lexicon, or *E. Bib.*, 'Ahava.'

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Gozan,' 'Halah,' and especially *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. xvii. 5 *f.* Stade and Schwally (in *SBOT*) are thorough as regards the collection of one class of facts, but leave all the rest out, not having looked underneath MT. and the text of 𝔊. Burney passes over the whole question.

same name, and a critical study of the parallel, 1 Chr. v. 26, makes it very likely that in an earlier form of that passage אחוא stood in the margin as a gloss on חבור אהוא or אחוא. One may add that it is most probably = אִשְׁחֹר (*i.e.* שְׁחֹר), *i.e.* the stream called 'Ḥabor' (or Chebar ?) was also called 'Ahava.' The region where it flowed was called, most probably, not 'Gozan,' but 'Bozan' (*i.e.* Ṣibeon [צבען], *i.e.* ישמעאל); and one may perhaps venture to add, חשרם, *i.e.* אִשְׁחַר־אֲרָם (disguised in MT. of Ezek. i. 3 as כשדים). The view here given is, I hope, an improvement on that given in the *Amer. Journ. Theol.*, July 1901. הר for נהר (though supported by 𝔊's ὄρη Μήδων in 1 K. xvii. 6) is needlessly bold. The rest of the proposal, however, is sound, and in particular הבא אל is, like אהוא, almost certainly a corruption of חמאל[יר]. Rawlinson's connexion of אהוא with Talm. איהי = mod. *Hît*, N.W. of Babylon, is ingenious, but certainly wrong.

2. The names in viii. 16 are common ones; their N. Arabian affinities can hardly be denied (cp. *Amer. Journ. Theol.*, 1891, p. 435). ראשים is questionable; often ראש and רעש turn out to be a corruption of אִשֻּׁר. Here, however, we may be content with שֹׁעֲרִים (see on Neh. vii. 45, 1 Chr. ix. 17). This explains the phrase 'his brethren the Nethinim'; the Shoărim and the Nethinim, *i.e.* originally the Asshurites and the Ethanites, were closely connected.

3. אִדּוֹ (*v.* 17) here only. Is it for עִדּוֹ? Or from אִדּוֹן (Neh. vii. 61) = אֵדָן (Ezra ii. 59)?—הוראש. It is an unsuitable guess when Siegfr. declares that Iddo was a secular chief appointed by the Persians; read הַשֹּׁעֵר. The 'Ethanites' (Nethinim) are 'his brethren'; read ואחיו, following 1 Esdr.

4. We have now reached a singular specimen of bad textual criticism on the part of the ancient redactor. 'At Casiphia the place' (*v.* 17)! At the very least we should have expected מְקוֹם כס׳. But why מקום at all? And what is כספיא? Halévy (*Journ. asiat.*, July-Aug. 1900) replies, Borsippa; Winckler (*AOF*, 2nd ser., iii. 509*ff.*), Opis-Seleucia-Ctesiphon. Nor must we omit to mention that both 1 Esdr. and 2 Esdr. connect כספיא with כסף, 'silver.' The one (1 Esdr. viii. 44) has *ἐν τῷ τόπῳ* [*τοῦ*] *γαζοφυλακίου*, the other (2 Esdr. viii. 17) *ἐν ἀργυρίῳ τοῦ τόπου*. This is not, indeed, correct, but it points in the right direction, whereas both Halévy and Winckler are very wide of the mark. כסף is indeed sometimes the corrupt form of a place-name—probably כשברי (see *e.g.* Isa. xlviii. 10, lii. 3; *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 129). Add to this that in Gen. xii. 6, xviii. 24, Isa. xxviii. 8, Ezek. xxxviii. 11, Hos. ii. 1, מקום is a worn-down fragment of ירקם, *i.e.* ירחמאל. The result is that כספיאמקום represents כשבר ירחמאלים (cp. עמקם, Jer. xlvii. 5), unless indeed כספיא is a corruption of אכשף, a place-name mentioned with Shimron, in a narrative which originally referred

to a defeat of the N. Arabians (see *Crit. Bib.* pp. 413, 446 *ff.*).

5. אִישׁ שֵׂכֶל (*v.* 17) has much puzzled the critics. Neither 'a man of discretion' nor Ish-sekel (an unattested personal name) is probable. Now that it has been shown that אשכל represents an ancient N. Arabian tribe-name and place-name (cp. on Gen. xiv. 13, Num. xiii. 23 *f.*), the correction to be made is obvious. The ש is due to 'Volksetymologie.'

6. The other names also point to N. Arabia; *e.g.* Mahli = Yeraḥme'eli (cp. Maḥal, Maḥlon), Sherebiah (cp. Sheber, a son of Caleb by Maakah, 1 Chr. ii. 48), Hashabiah (see on 'Heshbon,' Num. xxi. 26), Merari.

7. Can any one believe that the 'Nethinim' (*v.* 20) were temple-slaves, given (as a *gloss* declares) by David and the princes for the service of the Levites? Not as slaves, but as free men, do these persons join the company of returning exiles, and though they do not sign the great 'covenant,' yet they do unite with their 'brethren' in a solemn oath to walk in God's laws and to marry within the holy people (Neh. x. 28 *ff.*). They also have a residence at Jerusalem, which is referred to as a well-known point in topographical descriptions (Neh. iii. 31), and they share immunity from taxation with the priests and Levites (vii. 24).[1]

[1] See *Amer. Journ. Theol.* v. 436 *ff.* (Cheyne).

8. Must we not admit that the old methods are baffled by the textual difficulties of *v.* 27*b*? First, שנים. We have no right to follow Luc., and to read שנים עשר (*δέκα δύο*), for *δύο*, as Guthe has seen, is most probably a correction after MT. But how shall the presence of ש׳ be accounted for? Experience of newer methods helps us here. שנים not unfrequently represents ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל, the Ishmaelite or Yeraḥme'elite country on the N. Arabian border. That 'copper' (brass) was common in this region, is abundantly proved, if we accept the results of the more critical point of view. Copper or brass vessels are said to have been found in Jericho (the southern Jericho), Josh. vi. 24. Hiram, who came from [Miṣ]ṣor, was a bronze worker, 1 K. vii. 14. From Hadad-ezer, king of Zobah, David took 'exceeding much brass,' and from (the southern) Hamath David received vessels of brass fit to dedicate, with the silver and the gold, to Yahwè (2 S. viii. 10 *f.*). Of these notices—all of them important—one is specially valuable in this connexion. There was a southern as well as a northern Zobah, and the southern Zobah can be discerned by an experienced critic in the Ezra passage before us. That טובה and צהב may represent the same word, is pointed out in *E. Bib.*, *s.v.* 'Brass.' But what the original word was, could not be stated. Now, however, it is probable that the textual word is צובה. Read וכלי נחשת מצובה. The word צובה was

glossed, and from the margin there intruded the further gloss ישמן = ישמעאל. The closing words, חמודות כוהב, are explained by 2 S. viii. 10*b*, 11. The best bronze was but little less valued than gold.

CHAP. ix. In *v.* 1, as usually read, the position of the Egyptians between the Moabites and the Amorites, and also that of the Ammonites, Moabites, and Egyptians between the Jebusites and the Amorites, is somewhat strange. It would be a slight improvement to read האדמי for האמרי, following 1 Esdr. viii. 6 (which also passes over the Ammonites). But הארמי may be better (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. xvi. 3). Of course, 'the Misrites' spoken of are not those of Egypt but of N. Arabia.

CHAP. x. 1. The names in *vv.* 18-43 are like those in the lists of Chronicles. מכנדבי invites scepticism. 1 Esdr. ix. 34 has, *καὶ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν* Εζωρα = ומבני עזור. מכ' may represent מבני נדבו, and be a dittograph of מבני נ[ד]בו in *v.* 43. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Machnadebai.'

2. בן תקוה (*v.* 15) occurs again in 2 K. xxii. 14. ת' is a corruption of תקוע, *i.e.* the southern 'Tekoa'; the name is probably a form of מעכת (the southern Maacath). Cp. קוע, Ezek. xxiii. 23, which must have a similar origin. See on Jer. vi. 1, and *E. Bib.*, 'Tekoa.'—משלם, a conventionalized form of שלם, *i.e.* ישמעאל.—שבתי, a variation of שבעתי ('one belonging to Shib'ah')

or שפתי, *i.e.* צפתי (see *E. Bib.*, 'Shabbethai'). שבתי also occurs in a Sinaitic inscription (Cook, *Gloss.* p. 111), where it should have the same origin.

CHAPTER IV

NEHEMIAH

Can we find any grains of fact in this product of the imagination? We must at any rate learn to read underneath the present text. Winckler thinks there has been much clever *Überarbeitung*.

Chap. i. 1. According to some eminent critics, חֲכַלְיָה (*v.* 1) should be חַכַּלְיָה (Nöldeke, *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 24). There is no evidence known that the early Jewish scholars took this view, and we need not go out of our way to diminish the number of names which even those scholars did not recognize as religious. The name ought in the first instance to be grouped with חכילה (1 S. xxiii. 19, xxvi. 1 *f.*), the name of a place in David's early wanderings. חלק too may be compared. This is the name of one of the mountains or mountain-ranges (Josh. xi. 17 [αχελ, B], xii. 7), and is also probably a clan-name (Ḥilkiah, 2 K. xxii. 4), also חלקי (Ḥelḳai, Neh. xii. 15). It is best to trace all these forms to אחכל, *i.e.* אשחר-רכל. אח in proper names constantly represents אשחר, and כל (רל) is shortened from רכל, which originally

meant, not merchant, but Yerahme'elite. Nehemiah, then, was בן הרכלים, 'a son of the Raclites,' *i.e.* was of N. Arabian extraction. This explains the sequel.

2. 'Shushan,' from the ordinary point of view, is unobjectionable. If, however, other phenomena point decidedly to there being an underlying text, in which a dominant N. Arabian power takes the place at present usually assigned to Persia, we may take the original reading to have been שמשן, *i.e.* 'belonging to Shemesh = Ishmael.' Cp. on הששי, iii. 30, and on על־שׁשנים, in *Ps.*(2), Introd. p. xlviii;[1] cp. also ששן, 1 Chr. ii. 31, and *Traditions and Beliefs*, p. 488 (note 2).

3. For 'the God of heaven' here, and in ii. 4, 20, see note 2 on Ezra i.

4. 'Now I was cup-bearer to the king' (*v.* 11*b*). A remarkable statement, if the reference is to a king of Persia; for the office of royal cup-bearer was much sought after by high Persian nobles in the earlier period, though afterwards it was only committed to eunuchs. Apart from this, it is strange that a Jew should be cup-bearer; what was it that made Artaxerxes so friendly to the Jews? Did he wish to reward them for not taking part in the revolt of the Syrian satrap Megabyzos (*Jewish Religious Life after the*

[1] Cp. also the names quoted by Nöldeke (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 58) as reduplicated forms originating with small children—a view very far from correct.

Exile, p. 38)? The conjecture is natural, but it would be a boon to be relieved from the necessity of making it. If the original background of the narrative is N. Arabian, this relief is obtained. A Jewish cup-bearer at the court of the king of 'Pathros' (see note 1 on Ezra i.) is not less easy to understand than a Hebrew vizier of the king of Miṣrim in a far older narrative (Gen. xli. 39-43). Whether the statement is historical, is quite another matter.

Chap. ii. 1. Can we not get some fresh light on 'Sanballat the Horonite' (as he is called in MT. of *vv.* 10, 19), whose name and residence have led to so much discussion among critics? Let us begin with הַחֹרֹנִי. What does the pointing supply? Is 'Horon' the short for 'Beth-horon'? or equivalent to the Moabitish Horonaim, rather Ḥoron of Yam (see end of note)? Or should we, with Klost. (*Gesch.* p. 263), point חָרָנִי, and suppose that Sanballat was descended from the family of Israelitish priests which was sent back to Bethel the northern, and which may originally have been carried away to the northern Ḥaran. This implies that one of the elements in the name pointed 'Sanballat' is 'Sin' (the name of the Babylonian moon-god). But does סַנְבַלַּט really, as Schrader supposed (*KAT*(2), p. 382), come from Sin-uballiṭ[anni], *i.e.* 'Sin caused [me] to live'? This is the second point to consider. Winckler insists on Sin-muballiṭ, but this can hardly be

the origin of the Hebrew form. Let us try another course. In the case of סנחריב (see *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. xviii. 13) we have been led to doubt the existence of the divine name 'Sin' as an element in this compound name. We may well do the same here, and hold סנבלט to have come from שִׁן־תִּבְל, where שן (see *Crit. Bib.* on שן, 1 S. xiv. 4) represents ישמעאל. Cp. *Crit. Bib.* on סנסנה, Josh. xv. 31. From iv. 2 it would appear that 'Sanballat' was, in a large sense (cp. 2 K. xvii. 24), a Shimronite. He belonged, in fact, to the mixed population of worshippers of Yahwè in N. Arabia. 'Ḥaranite' is probably correct; the southern Ḥaran is intended, the place known elsewhere as חרן ים, Ḥaran of Yam (= Yaman; see *Two Religions*, Index).

2. Why 'Tobiah' is called 'the slave,' the commentators have not satisfactorily explained. He would seem to have been Sanballat's equal; in Neh. vi. 12, 14 he is even mentioned before Sanballat. Yet the explanation is simple. Who that has any experience in textual criticism can fail to see that העבר has come from הערבי, 'the Arabian,' which a scribe wrote in error, and as usual left undeleted. הערבי comes very soon afterwards (see next note); cp. on iv. i. As to the name טוביה, there should be no doubt as to טוב. This occurs as the name of a region in Judg. xi. 3, 5 and (in a compound name) in 2 S. x. 6, 8. It most probably comes from תובל, an

ancient abbreviation of אתבעל, *i.e.* ישמעאל. יה or יהו may originally have represented ירח, *i.e.* ירחם. The name must have been early conventionalized in a religious sense, but continued to be specially N. Arabian.

3. 'Geshem the Arabian'; also 'Gashmu' (vi. 6). Prof. H. P. Smith surely goes too far when he says that the origin of the title Arabian 'cannot now be made out' (*Old Test. History*, p. 384). It is not enough, however, to connect (with Euting) the name גשמו (pointing גַּשְׁמוּ) with the Sinaitic proper name גשמו, and to account for the prominence of an Arabian in S. Palestine by the great Nabatæan migration into Edom (see *E. Bib.*, 'Geshem'; 'Arabia,' § 6; 'Edom,' § 9; Winckler, *GI*, i. 203). The key to the name is furnished by the reference to גישן among the Calebites, 1 Chr. ii. 47, where 𝔊^{A} gives *γηρσωμ*. Geshan, Gershom, Gershon, Goshen are, in fact, to be all grouped together, and all arise out of גרש = שחר = אַשְׁחֻר. Cp. 𝔊, Gen. xlv. 10, *γῆ γεσεμ Ἀραβίας*. To compare Arabic *jasuma*, 'to be bulky, massive,' is unwise.

Chap. III. 1. The name 'sheep-gate' has been variously explained. Originally it may have been שער צען, where צען (like צאן in 1 S. xvi. 11, xvii. 34, and elsewhere) represents ישמעאל. Cp. on *vv.* 3, 13, 28.

2. Can it be rash to question the reading מגדל המאה, 'tower of the hundred' (*v.* 1), and to class the expression with קרית הארבע, xi. 25, Gen. xxxv.

27? Not unfrequently (*e.g.* in Gen. xiv. 14, xv. 13, Judg. viii. 10, 1 S. xviii. 27, 2 K. xix. 35) מאה has possibly come from some corruption of ירחמאל. This is probably the case here. May we not also plausibly suppose that מ׳ חנאל is another name of the same town, since ח׳ is probably a modification of חנמאל, *i.e.* חֲנוֹ ירחמאל (cp. חמן, 'a pillar of Baal-Yeraḥme'el'). So too in xii. 39.

3. Why the fish-gate (*v.* 3)? The answer is not satisfactory. Parallels suggest ש׳ הַגְּדִים, 'gate of the Gadites.' Cp. Num. xxxii. 1.

4. בני הסנאה (in Ezra ii. 35 without art.), *v.* 3; in Neh. xi. 9, הסנואה. Are critics really satisfied with the current explanations—even with that of the eminent historian Ed. Meyer (see *E. Bib.*, col. 1971)? 'Senaah' is apparently a place-name, and, like so many others, indicates its Ishmaelite origin by its name, if we have experience to enlighten us. In 2 Chr. xiii. 19 'Yeshanah' is mentioned; in the parallel, 1 S. vii. 13, 𝔊 and Pesh. support the same reading. ישן, like שן, שמן, and משנה, is sometimes a corruption of ישמעאל. This leads one to ask further, whether in *v.* 6 we should do best to read 'the gate of Yeshanah' (omitting the art.) or 'of Ishmael' (restoring ישמ׳)?

5. משיובאל. See *T.* and *B.* on Gen. xxxvi. 39 (Mehetabel).

6. צרפים, in *v.* 8, surely not 'goldsmiths,' *i.e.* belonging to that guild. Read בן־הצרפי, *i.e.* 'son of a Ṣarephite' (= Ṣarephathite). So in *v.* 31.

Similarly, for בן־הרקחים (of the guild of perfumers!) read בן־ארם־חנקים, 'son of an Aram-Ḥanokite.[1] Cp. 2 S. xv. 17, 'and they tarried in Beth-merḥak' (R.V.), where Beth-merḥak comes from Beth-Aram-Ḥanoḳ, the name of the meeting-place of David's Arabian bodyguard. The improbable name חרחיה, which now intervenes between בן and צר׳, is a corruption either of a misplaced gloss ההרה (so S. A. Cook, *E. Bib.*, 'Harhaiah'), or rather of הרקחי, a similar scribal error to that mentioned in note 2 on chap. ii.

7. In *v.* 10 (also ix. 5), חשבניה either miswritten for חשביה (*v.* 17) or a corruption of חשבדנה (see on viii. 4).

8. 'Dung-gate' (*v.* 13)? Ash-heap gate? Surely not. שער האשפות probably comes from ש׳ צ[ר]פת, 'gate of Ṣarephath.' Cp. שפט (personal name), ultimately from צרפת or צפת.

9. What can 'the upper house of the king' (*v.* 26) mean? Or shall we, with 𝔊 and margin of R.V., understand 'the upper tower . . . from the house of the king'? And even in this case the meaning of 'the house of the king' is obscure. The problem is complicated by the circumstance that *v.* 26 is introduced by the words (which are evidently a gloss), 'Now the Nethinim dwelt in Ophel.' It can, however, be simplified by textual criticism. המלך in Num. xx. 17, 2 S. xiv. 26, Jer.

[1] For the Ḥanokite (or Anaḳite) tribe, see *The Veil*, pp. 8, 51; ב and פ interchanging.

xxxvi. 26, xxxviii. 6, like מלך in אבימלך, etc., is an early development of עמלק = ירחמאל. A plausible meaning of בית המלך העליון now presents itself,—'the upper house of Yeraḥme'el' (*i.e.* of the Yeraḥme'elites). And if we ask who 'the Yeraḥme'elites' in this connexion are, the reply is easy; it was probably a guild, or group of guilds, of temple-ministers, such as the Šo'ărim (originally Asshurim) and the Nethinim (originally Ethanim). In *v.* 31 we meet with a 'house of the Nethinim'; that the Nethinim or Ethanites were Yeraḥme'elites or N. Arabians, is clear. See, further, on vii. 44-46, x. 21, and cp. *Amer. Journ. Theol.* v., 1901, p. 440.

10. 'The gate of the horses' (*v.* 28)? But if 'Hazar-susah' (Josh. xix. 5) and 'Hazar-susim' (1 Chr. iv. 31) have come from Ashḥur-ishmael—and thorough critics can hardly doubt this—שער הסוסים has grown out of שער ישמעאל. See *T. and B.* p. 488 (note 2), and cp. next note.

11. 'Hanun the sixth son of Zalaph' (*v.* 30)? A testing passage. All that the ordinary criticism can say is that השני may be a mutilated and corrupt form of וְיֹשְׁבֵי זָנוֹחַ (Ryssel; see *v.* 13), or that it may cover over a statement as to Hanun's birthplace (Reuss, Guthe). The latter view, which Guthe only presents as a 'suspicion,' seems to me in the highest degree probable. For it is a fact of experience that סוס (see note 9) and שוש or שש have repeatedly come out of some one of the N. Arabian race- or district-names, viz. either אַשּׁוּר or, better,

ישמעאל. We may therefore venture to explain ששי, both here and in Josh. xv. 14, Judg. i. 10, as = ישמ׳. Cp. ישישי, 1 Chr. v. 14. For צלף = צבל, *i.e.* ישמ׳, cp. שלף, *i.e.* ישבל, Gen. x. 26, and צלפחד, *i.e.* יצבל-חדד, Num. xxvi. 33.

12. 'Goldsmiths' (*v.* 31)? 'Nethinim'? 'Merchants'? See notes 6 and 8, and note that Guthe (1896) has already suggested that צרפי may be = צרפתי, though he still hesitates because 'the context points to a goldsmith.' This is because he supposes הרכלים to mean the 'merchants.' But who can doubt that רכל, like רחל, sometimes represents ירחמאל? So *e.g.* in 1 K. x. 15, Ezek. xvii. 4, Cant. iii. 6. Possibly, too, רכלים, 'merchants' (see xiii. 20), has the same origin; *i.e.* a modification of ירחמאלים became used for 'merchants' because of the high commercial reputation of the N. Arabians.

13. 𝔊^{B} gives *καὶ εἶπεν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ, Αὕτη ἡ δύναμις Σομορων, ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι οὗτοι*, etc. זה חיל ש׳, *i.e.* ה׳ ש׳ is a gloss. Read, however, זה ירחמאל ש׳, *i.e.* 'this means Yer.-Shimron,' gloss on אחיו.

14. The alteration of האמללים (*v.* 34) into הָאֵלָה (Guthe, following 𝔊) is parallel to that of האליל (Isa. x. 10) into הָאֵלָה (*SBOT*, following 𝔊). Both changes are wrong, *i.e.*, if we wish for a satisfactory sense, and one that harmonizes with our results elsewhere, we must read, in the one case, some form of הירחמאלים, and in the other,

some form of ירחמאל. Luc. combines the readings האמללים and האלה, both practically corruptions of אמלים. The statement of Jos. *Ant.* xi. 7. 2, that Sanballat was Persian governor of Samaria, is unhistorical. On his further statement see on Ezra iv. 9-11, and see Winckler, *AOF*, 2nd series, ii. 230. It is possible that we have two glosses on אחיו, viz. (1) ירח' שמרון and (2) אמלים. Thus we get, 'And he said before his brethren (glosses, Yeraḥme'el-Shimron; the Amalites), What are the Jews doing?'

Chap. iv. For האשדודים (*v.* 1) we might read הָאַשּׁוּרִיה. Cp. $\mathfrak{G}^{BA}$, Am. iii. 9, *ἐν* 'Ασσυρίοις, where MT. has באשדוד. The name 'Asshur' is, of course, archaizing. Similarly in xiii. 23 (see note). But, inasmuch as Ashdod is simply = 'Asshur-Dod,' this is not strictly necessary. There were probably several Ashdods.

Chap. vi. 1. Sanballat is the representative of populations of mixed origin in the N. Arabian borderland. The narrator evidently believes that the territory occupied by the Jews under Nehemiah extended into this region (see on vii. 6 *ff.*, xi. 25 *ff.*). He therefore represents Sanballat as suggesting for a rendezvous and place in the borderland, not far probably from his own territory, if it did not even lie within it. כפרים is very possibly the same as כפירה, one of the Gibeonite place-names, a deformation of Akrabbah (*The Veil*, p. 127). אונו also in Ezra

ii. 33, Neh. vii. 37, xi. 35 (see note), 1 Chr. viii. 12. That On, Onam, Onan, and Ono are specially southern names is at any rate made highly probable in *E. Bib.*, 'On,' etc.; cp. also on Gen. xli. 45, Am. i. 5, Hos. iv. 15. In xi. 34, Lod (*i.e.* גלעד; cp. on לודים, Gen. x. 13) and 'Ono' stand in apposition to גי החרשים, which has evidently come from גֵּי אשחֲרים, 'valley of the Ashḥurites.' 'Ono also occurs in Hos. xii. 3, where read, 'In Ethbaal he tricked Ashḥur, and in Ono he fought with Elohim.' Even 𝔊 (Hos.) still preserves a record that the contest took place in 'Beth-on.'

2. 'Mehetabel' (*v.* 10); see *T. and B.* on Gen. xxxvi. 39.

Chap. vii. 1. Bertheau-Ryssel comment thus on the words 'and I found written therein,' *v.* 5: 'It is clear that Nehemiah saw reason to insert the following register or catalogue in his memoir. From this memoir, together with the other sections derived from it, the register came into the Book of Nehemiah, and so it is explained how the document already known to us from Ezra ii. is repeated here.' Torrey, however, advocates the view that both *vv.* 1-5 and the so-called register are the Chronicler's work. It remains to ask what is the source from which the writer of vii. 5 professes to have derived the register. According to our present text he calls it ספר היחש העולים בראשונה. But the two last words cannot grammatically be connected with

the two first. Guthe (*SBOT*) is content to remark that בר׳ העולים must be a later addition. But why this addition? The truth probably is that עולם[ה], like עולם (Gen. xxi. 33), represents either ישמעאל or ירחמאל, and is a gloss on the word which underlies היחש. That word is, probably, אַשְׁחֵר; that 'Asshur' and 'Yeraḥme'el' were used synonymously, we have seen again and again. Just as ספר הישר has come from ספר אַשֻּׁר, so ס׳ היחש represents ס׳ אשחר. The book so called may have contained all sorts of documents relative to Asshur or Yeraḥme'el (cp. on ספר מלחמות, *i.e.* ספר חמל-תמול,[1] Num. xxi. 14). It may be objected that, just before, we meet with the cognate verbal form להתיחש; but this only shows how easy it was for אשח׳ to become corrupted into a word which occurs nowhere else—יחש. There still remains בראשונה. This probably comes from ערב-אשור, for בר often stands for ערב and אש for אשור.

2. The true superscription of the document (framed, as Torrey thinks, by the Chronicler) is אלה בני המדינה (*v.* 6), to which two glosses were added. When the corruption had taken place, it was natural for משבי הגולה וגו׳ to be added. It will be noticed that the names in *vv.* 6-67 and xi. 4-36 point, upon the whole, to the N. Arabian borderland. Many of the exiles who returned

[1] מלח comes from some form of ירחמאל (cp. גיא המלח and מות from תמול (= Ishmael); see *The Veil*, p. 157 *f.*

seem to have settled in the part of that region which adjoined Judah. The others, too, were at any rate deeply interested in, and probably connected with, the borderland,

3. As to the twelve names in this list, it is not denied that names pointing to N. Arabia might quite well have been borne by northern Israelites. It is, however, a remarkable fact that all the names are of this character, and we must also remember that the setting of the list—*i.e.* the narratives among which it is placed—also refers us to the borderland. For 'Zerubbabel' see on Ezra iv. 3; for 'Jeshua'='Joshua,' on the name of Jesus (below). 'Nehemiah,' 'Nahamani,' and 'Nehum' all have the same root, and point to the south (cp. 'Naham,' 1 Chr. iv. 19; and on 'Noah,' Gen. v. 29; also on 'Menahem,' 2 K. xv. 14). 'Azariah' is, in some of its occurrences (see *E. Bib.*, *s.v.*), plainly a Yeraḥme'elite name. 'Raamiah' (רעמיה)—in Ezra ii., Reeliah (רעליה)—of course comes from 'Yeraḥme'el'; cp. מרעלה, Josh. xix. 11. 'Mordecai,' doubtless, looks like the Bab. name Mardukêia, which is a formation from Marduk (a *hard* formation; see Johns, *AJSL*, April 1902, p. 159), and when the name occurs in the Book of Esther, it has furnished some of the material for a complicated and ingenious mythological explanation of the origin of the Esther story. It is, however, a strong objection (see on Esth. ii. 5) to this view of the name in Esther,

that the other names with which 'Mordecai' is grouped are of quite another character; and here, too, the name thus understood would stand alone among the twelve, 'Zerubbabel,' as we have seen, not being of Babylonian origin. It so happens that we have a Calebite name 'Mered,' which Luc. gives as Βαραδ (1 Chr. iv. 17); also a name Bered (1 Chr. vii. 20). This probably comes from Bir-dadda,[1] a N. Arabian name mentioned by Ašurbanipal, and which also seems to underlie 'Berodach-baladan' in 2 K. xx. 12. Not improbably מרדכי comes from ברדך, and this from ברדד (Bar-dad; cp. בדד, Gen. xxxvi. 35).—The 'Belsar' of 1 Esdr. v. 8 = Baal-Asshur. 'Bilshan' (MT.) is to be explained like 'Bishlam,' Ezra iv. 7. Both לשן and שלם are current corruptions of ישמעאל; initial ב represents ערב.—'Mispereth' is to be grouped with 'Misrephoth-maim' (Josh. xi. 8), *i.e.* Ṣarephath-yaman; cp. 1 Esdr. v. 8, *ασφάρασος*. A connexion with Old Pers. *aspadata* (also proposed for 'Aspatha,' Esth. ix. 7) is unsuitable.—'Bigwai' or (better) 'Bagoi' (*v.* 9; Ezra viii. 14), Wellh. identifies with Persian 'Bagoas,' and infers the late origin of the list. Meyer (*Entstehung*, 157 *ff.*) disputes this. Directly after the capture of Babylon, a Jew may have adopted the 'Persian name.' But Persian names are improbable (see on Esther); *baga*, 'god,' does not help us. בג is possibly from אחאב = גב; see *The Veil*, p. 148.

[1] So Eberhard Schrader. Could we read Bardadda?

Or we might read בנוי, Binnui (ii. 24); cp. Baanah, Bani, Benaiah.

4. Proceeding to the laity at large, we find first the 'benê Par'osh,' a name which drives the critics into a corner. Par'osh, 'flea,' may not indeed be much worse than Gaal or Gual, 'dung-beetle,' and Delitzsch may illustrate the name by the Assyrian name Paršu'û ('flea'?). It still remains incredible that the most eminent non-Levitical 'father's house' (see *E. Bib.*, 'Parosh') should have borne the name 'Flea-clan.' Meyer, in his reply to Wellhausen (*Julius Wellhausen und meine Schrift, etc.*, 1897, p. 21), thinks that it may have been a satirical name, but how are we helped by this? Textual criticism ought to help us to certainty. And so it does. To compare 'Shepher' (Num. xxxiii. 23 *f.*) and 'Shiphrah' (Ex. i. 15) would be too easy an expedient. But the initial letters פר, which are indistinguishable from פד, at once remind us of פדן, פדיה, פדהאל, פדהצור[1] (see Num. i. 10), and it most fortunately happens that, quite apart from פרעש, we find it necessary to explain פד in these names as ערב = בר, and the important clan-name פשחור (cp. on Jer. xx. 1) as equivalent to ערב-אשחור. This gives us the key to פרעש, which most probably comes from בַּרְאֶשֶׁר. Both Bar-Ashḥur and Bar-Asshur, then, are in the first instance names of districts.

5. Passing by Shephatiah (cp. on 'Shaphat,'

[1] פדן (MT. 'Paddan') comes from ארכן = אפקן; פריה from ערב־ירחו.

1 K. xix. 16) and Araḥ (certainly not 'wayfarer' [Nöldeke], for אחר has often come from אַשְׁחֵר), we pause at פחת מואב. The clan so called fell into two branches, Jeshua and Joab. 'Jeshua' appears in Neh. xi. 26 (see note), where it takes the place of the Shema of Josh. xv. 26 and the Sheba of Josh. xix. 2. 'Yoab' occurs in the form 'Atroth-beth-Yoab' in 1 Chr. ii. 54; its people was a son of Salma, b. Ḥur, b. Caleb. Also in 1 Chr. iv. 14, as the name of a son of Seraiah, b. Kenaz; here it receives a singular addition, generally rendered 'father of the valley of smiths, for they were smiths.' This valley with the strange name occurs again in xi. 35, after the place-names Lod and Ono. Several of these names are evidently corrupt, and the true originals at once suggest themselves. 'Atroth' certainly = Ashtoreth (= Ashḥoreth); see on Dt. i. 4, iii. 17. Yoab = Yarḥu-'Arāb (*The Veil*, pp. 149 *f.*); Ḥur = Ashḥur; גיא חרשים (valley of smiths) = גיא אשחרים, 'valley of Ashḥurites,' while אבי, prefixed to the latter phrase in 1 Chr. iv. 14, most probably (as often) represents an original ערב. Evidently the names are southern, and most probably they attach properly to N. Arabian localities. And now as to פחת מואב. That this is impossible as a personal name, is rightly felt by Meyer, but he himself has no light to throw on the name. Yet the origin of פחת is plain; it is of course to be grouped with יפתח (Josh. xv. 43) and יפתח־אל

(Josh. xix. 14, 27), and יפתח, like יפת (probably), comes from נפתוח, whence נפתחים, the name of a tribe said to have descended from מצרים (the N. Arabian Muṣri) in Gen. x. 13.[1] It should also be combined with תפוח (usually explained 'apple-town,' Josh. xii. 17[2]) and with נפח (Num. xxi. 30). Whether מואב is right may be questioned. We should perhaps have expected יואב. Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Pahath-moab.'

6. 'Elam' (*v.* 12)—what is this? The name of a clan which had been settled in Elam? No, but one of the many clan-names and district-names which in days long-past had been corrupted from 'Yeraḥme'el,' and which record the wide extent of the N. Arabian migration. In *v.* 34 we have, apparently, 'another Elam,' but really 'Elam of Ashḥur' (עילם אַשְׁחֻר). Torrey (*Ezra Studies*, pp. 166 *f.*) is baffled by 'Elam.' No wonder.

7. 'Azgad' (*v.* 17) probably comes from Azzur-Gad. See *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 144; *The Veil of Hebrew History*, p. 15. 'Adonikam' (*v.* 18); cp. on Ezra viii. 13.—אטר, 'Ater' (*v.* 21), not 'left-handed' (Nöldeke), but from אשחור = אשתר. עטרות (see note 5) has the same origin.—'Hashum'; cp. Heshmon, Hashmonah (as a widely represented southern clan-name; see occurrences, and below,

[1] *T. and B.* p. 378.

[2] See *The Veil of Hebrew History*, p. 119 (n. 1); *The Two Religions*, p. 348.

on Asmonæans).—נבו אחר (*v.* 33); in Ezra ii. 29 simply נבו. Read נבו אשחר; cp. note 6, and *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 136 *f.*—סנאה (*v.* 38), but in iii. 3 הסנאה. To be grouped with סנח, 1 S. xiv. 4; השן, 1 S. vii. 12; ישנה, 2 Chr. xiii. 19; משנה, xi. 9 (see note); אסנת, Gen. xli. 45; שמן, Isa. x. 27 (see *Crit. Bib.*). The common original of all these forms is ישמעאל.—'Pashḥur'; see on *v.* 8. —הודוה (*v.* 43); cp. יהודיה. From יהוד ירח, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'elite Judah. Note that a certain Yehudi (Jer. xxxvi. 14) is a descendant of Cushi. I need hardly say that קדמיאל, like קמואל (Gen. xxii. 21), represents a distorted ירחמאל.

8. On the parallel, Ezra ii. 41, Berth.-Rys. remarks: 'Of the three great classes of singers—Asaph, Jeduthun, Heman (1 Chr. xxv.)—only some (128) of the class of Asaph return.' Possibly, however, the title המשררים, prefixed to בני אסף, was intended to refer to the בני השערים (originally בני אשורים), the נתינים (originally איתנים), and the בני עבדי שלמה (originally בני ערב ישמעאל);[1] *i.e.* all these clans, of N. Arabian origin, were devoted to the service of sacred song. In this connexion note שלמה, from ישמעאל, in headings of certain psalms and collection of proverbs. Cp. *Ps.*[2] Introd. p. lxiv. On the 'benê Asaph,' the 'benê Asshurim,' the 'Nethinim,' and the 'benê Arab-Ishmael,' see *Ps.*[2] pp. xxii, xlii; *Amer. J. of Theol.*, July

[1] Cp. the familiar Abed-Nego = 'Arāb-Nebo.

1901 ('From Isaiah to Ezra'); *E. Bib.*, 'Solomon's Servants, Children of.' It is possible that the 'benê Asshurim' became door-keepers, and certain it is that the Ethanites were afterwards ignorantly represented as the descendants of captives of war made by Solomon (see Ezra viii. 20).

9. Note that the names in *v.* 45 all suggest N. Arabia, unless Haṭiṭa be an exception. 'Shallum' points to 'Ishmael'; 'Ater' to 'Ashtor' (see on *v.* 21); 'Talmon' to 'Ishmael' (see on Josh. xv. 24); 'Akkub,' like 'Jaakob,' to ''Ah'ab';[1] 'Shobai' to 'Ishmael' (see on 2 S. xvii. 27). For 'Akkub' cp. also the Assyrian name Uḳubu, and parallels cited by Johns, *Deeds*, No. 502; also *Two Religions*, Index, 'Aḥ'ab.'

10. Confining myself to the most certainly explained names in *vv.* 46-56 (the 'Nethinim,' see on iii. 26), let me notice טבעות (*v.* 46), to be grouped with טַבָּת (Judg. vii. 22) and יטבה (2 K. xxi. 19). All alike come from יחבעל = ישמעאל (cp. אתבעל, 1 K. xvi. 31).—קירס (Ezra ii., קרס) and פדון (*v.* 47) should be grouped respectively with יששכר (see on Gen. xxx. 18), גשור, אשחור, and probably with כורש (Ezra i. 1, etc.) and כרשנא (Esth. i. 14), and with פדן in פדן־ארם, cp. note 4, on 'Parosh.'—'Lebanah,' of course, goes with 'Libnah' (Num. xxxiii. 20 *f.*; 2 K. xix. 8).—'Salmai' and 'Giddel' (cp. 'Haggedolim,' xi. 14) point to 'Salmathi' (Salmah) and

[1] *Two Religions*, Index; *T. and B.* p. 173.

'Gilead' respectively; Ezra ii., however, has Shalmon = Ishme'eli.—'Reaiah' or (1 Esdr. v. 31) 'Yair' of course = 'Yeraḥme'el'; in 1 Chr. iv. 2 'Reaiah' is a Calebite, son of Shobal (Ishmael).—'Paseah' (as if 'halting'), a corruption of Pinḥas, *i.e.* probably Naphtaḥ-ašḥur. In 1 Chr. iv. 12 a Calebite name.—'Besai' (בסי) from יבוס. See on Josh. xv. 8; Judg. xix. 10.—'Meunim,' like 'Meonenim' (see on Judg. ix. 37), represents 'Ishmeelim.' Fragments of great ethnics became the names of branches of the race which bore as its designation the common original of these fragments. There is no occasion to suppose that the clan descended from Uzziah's captives (2 Chr. xxvi. 7).—'Nephushesim' (in Ezra ii., 'Nephisim'), another Ishmaelite clan-name; cp. 'Ishpan' (1 Chr. viii. 2) and 'Shaphan' (2 K. xxii. 12), and note that נפשי and נפשו are often miswritten for ישמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל. See on Judg. v. 18, 21.—'Bakbuk' goes with 'Bakbukiah,' 'Bukkiah,' 'Habakkuk,' and finally 'Jaakob,' the original of which is אחאב (Ashḥur-'Arāb).—'Ḥarḥur,' not 'fever' (Nöld.), but, like Ḥur, from 'Ashḥur'; in 1 Esdr. v. 31 the form is *ασουρ*.—'Ḥarsha' (see on *v.* 61) has the same origin.—'Barkos,' either from ערב־כוש or, better, from ערב־אשחור. Note that 'Ḥarsha' precedes and 'Sisera' (also an Asshurite name) follows.—'Sisera'; see on Judg. iv. 2.—Between 'benê Besai' and 'b. Meunim' Ezra ii. gives 'benê

Asnah,' when אסנה, like אסנת (*T. and B.* p. 471; Gen. xli. 45), represents a shortened corrupt form of ישמ', with fem. ending.

11. Among the names of the *benê 'arab-ishmael* (*vv.* 57-59), note ספרת (Ezra ii., הס'), probably from צרפת[1] (cp. *Two Religions*, p. 72 (note 2), on 'Kiryath Sepher,' Josh. xv. 15; 'Sephar,' Gen. x. 30).—יעלא (Ezra ii., יעלה), like יעל, Judg. iv. 17, represents either ירחמ' or ישמ'. — 'Darḳon'; group with 'Ben-deḳer,' 1 K. iv. 9 (see *Crit. Bib.*). — 'Hattil' (חטיל), probably from 'Aḥiṭal,' where corrupt forms of 'Ashḥur' and 'Ishmael' (cp. on 'Talmon,' *v.* 45) respectively are combined. Cp. Abiṭal, Ḥamuṭal. — פכרת הצביים. The second element is clearly the צבעים = צביים (*i.e.* ישמעאלים, cp. צבעון) of Gen. xiv. 2. פכרת, like ספרת (*v.* 57), needs a slight transposition of letters. Read כְּפַרַת (אקרבת) and cp. (see p. 10) the ill-understood כפר העמוני, Josh. xviii. 24.—אמון (in Ezra ii., אמי). אם in compound names represents אֵרָם, as אב represents עֵרֶב. אמון therefore may come from ארמון; cp. ארמני, 2 S. xxi. 8. 1 Esdr. v. 34 has *αλλων* [B], *αδλων* [A]. The latter suggests ארלן. The origin is obvious.

12. Tel-melaḥ = Tubal-Yeraḥme'el, Tel-ḥarsha = Tubal-Ashḥur (*v.* 61), as shown in *E. Bib.*, *s.vv.* 'Kerub' (כרוב), if N. Arabian affinities are to be

[1] The question, however, remains whether both Ṣarephath and Sepher may not originally have meant Ashḥur-'Arāb (ר = פ; ח = ע and ץ = צ; ס = ש).

presumed, represents כבר (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. i. 3).—Nehemiah continues אדון ואמר, but Ezra אדן אמר. Probably אד[ו]ן is equivalent to עדן (cp. on אדניה, 2 S. iii. 3), and certainly אמר represents ארם, *i.e.* ירחמאל. Eden-arām is a very possible form (see on Gen. ii. 8).

13. In *v.* 63, as elsewhere, ברזלי is certainly from ערב ישמעאלי; cp. איזבל = ערב ישם', and note that ברזל is sometimes a redactor's production out of רבשל, *i.e.* ערב ישם' (see on Gen. iv. 22,[1] Dt. xxxiii. 25). There is no necessity to think of the 'Barzillai' of 2 S. xvii. 27, etc.

14. The enigmatical title התרשתא (for textual details see *E. Bib.*) can be explained only by applying a new key. Letters have to be transposed, and the result should point to N. Arabia. Now, there are two words, evidently corrupt, which contain nearly the same letters, and which have already revealed their secret. One is תרשיש, *i.e.* שתור[א]; the other, שהדותא (Gen. xxxi. 47), *i.e.* אשחרת. התרשתא therefore comes from האשתרי, 'the Ashtarite.' The person spoken of was known by the region from which he (or an ancestor) came. Nehemiah, for instance, may have been so designated. Cp. Cushi. As parallels in Assyrian names we should note Akkadi, Ḥamatai, Muṣurai, Ninuai, Ṣidunai, Tabalai, and especially Aššurai, which, it is true, are otherwise explained by Johns, *AJSL*, July 1902, pp. 246 *ff.*

[1] *T. and B.* on Gen.; *D. and F.* on Deut.

Chap. vii. 65 *ff.* First of all, how surprising that in the specification of the living possessions of the community, singing men and singing women should be grouped with horses, mules, camels, and asses. Next, how strange that, beside phenomena which appear adverse to the view that the list refers to those who returned from exile, there should be some which, as the text stands, appear to enforce such a reference. These two points may be taken together. The well-known commentator Alf. Bertholet holds as strongly as Ed. Meyer (*Entst.* p. 192) that *vv.* 68 *f.* supply a conclusive proof that the list really is a list of those who came up from captivity. On the other hand, remarks Torrey, 'he does not in the least succeed in answering the objections which [certain] scholars have made [see Kosters, *Het Herstel*, pp. 37 *ff.*] to this document as a list of the Jews who returned from Babylonia in the time of Cyrus. That is, internal evidence shows that this (if *genuine*) cannot be a list of returning exiles; and yet equally strong evidence shows that it cannot be anything else; this is the perplexing situation' (review of Bertholet's commentary, *Journ. of Amer. Theol.*, Jan. 1903). Torrey accepts the words העלים משבי הגולה as genuine. On this point he seems to me mistaken, as also in drawing a critical inference from the reference in the traditional text to 'horses,' 'mules,' 'camels,' and 'asses.' In 1 K. v. 6, x. 26, Ezek. xxvii. 14,

Isa. lxvi. 20, Zech. xiv. 15, we have already found occasion to look closely into references to these animals (for 'camels' see also *T. and B.* on Gen. xii. 16, xxxvii. 25; *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. vi. 5, viii. 21, 26). Cp. also the analogous case of the supposed names of vegetables in Num. xi. 4. I hold, then, that סוסיהם should be אֲשֻׁרִים; that פרדיהם should be פרתים; that גמלים should be ירחמאלים; and that חמרים is a very early ethnic, originally derived from ירחמאל, and indicating one of the N. Arabian clan which might loosely perhaps be called Yeraḥme'elite. The singing men and singing women, as Ber.-Ryssel thinks, were ordinary or secular singers, and perhaps of non-Israelite origin (may we compare Eccles. ii. 8?). Probably enough. There were Yeraḥme'elites who were devoted to sacred song, and those also whose talents were exerted in enlivening ordinary feasts and banquets.

On *susim* (horses) cp. also the Phœn. name עבדססם (Cooke, 62) and סססי (Cooke, 81), where ססם is *not* a Phœn. god, Sasom or Sasm, but = ישמעאל. See *E. Bib.*, 'Sisamai'; note סססי in 1 Chr. ii. 40 is expressly given as a Yeraḥme'elite name.

Chap. viii. 1. 'Hashbaddanah' (*v.* 4) is difficult. It may, however, come from חש = אשחר (cp. on נשדים, Gen. xi. 31), and נדב, a well-known southern clan-name. Note the 'Nabarias' of 1 Esdr. ix. 44. Cp. on 'Hashabniah,' ix. 5.

2. הָהָר means the nearest highlands on which the trees mentioned could be found growing. As for the trees, there has been much misunderstanding (see *D. and F.* pp. 112 *ff.*). For עֵץ שֶׁמֶן (*v.* 15) see on Dt. xii. 2; for עֵץ עֲבֹת, on Lev. xxiii. 40. הֲדַס is usually identified with the myrtle. Note, however, that הדס has only a S. Arabian parallel. The fact, moreover, that הרס, Isa. xix. 18, and חרס, Judg. i. 35, viii. 13, most probably come from אַשְׁחוּר, coupled with the fact that trees in the O.T. (critically treated) often derive their names from a region where they were common, suggests that הדס may originally have been שחר[א], 'the tree of Ashḥur'; cp. תאשור (Isa. xli. 19, lx. 13). Observe that in Isa. lv. 13 הדס is parallel to ברוש. Possibly, too, it is the same as the עֵץ הָדָר, or rather עֵץ הֲדַד, of Lev. xxiii. 40. It is not probable that the tree meant was the myrtle, because of the inclusion of the הדס in the same list of trees with distinctively mountain-trees, with which the 'myrtle' could not be expected to grow. See *Mines of Isaiah.*

3. This, then, was the first festival of סֻכּוֹת. Till this *period* (so much at least we may infer) the great autumn festival had not been represented as the feast of 'booths.' What the original name probably was (Ashkalath = Ashtart) is set forth in *Decline and Fall*, pp. 118 *f.* Note once more that the myrtle was sacred to Ashtart.

CHAP. ix. 1. בָּנִי and בִּנֵי, both perhaps from

בן, *i.e.* בעל, which represents the second part of ישמעאל or ירחמאל (ב for מ). Cf. אשבן, אחבן.

2. Point בְּמִצְרִים (*v.* 17).

3. 'Forty years' (*v.* 21). See *Traditions and Beliefs*, p. 264.

4. 'Since the time of the kings of Asshur unto this day' (*v.* 32). Does the writer mean that the sad trouble which has come upon Israel began in the time of the kings of Assyria or in the time of the kings of the N. Arabian Asshur (Ashḥur)? Consistency favours the latter alternative. Cp. Isa. lii. 4.

CHAP. xi. 1. The description of Judah as ben-Hassenuah (*v.* 9) is strange. The original reading was some corruption of 'Ishmael,' as shown on iii. 3. This gives us a clue to the meaning of משנה, which is not 'an official of the second rank' (Berth.-Rys.), but = שמן, *i.e.* ישמעאל. Possibly there was a quarter of the city called 'Ishmael.' Note that in 2 K. xxii. 14 Huldah is said to have dwelt 'in Jerusalem, in Mishneh' (see *Decline and Fall*, pp. 19 *f.*).

2. 'Zabdiel, son of the great ones' (𝔊), in *v.* 14 is as startling as 'Ono, the valley of the craftsmen,' in *v.* 35. הגדולים should be הגלעדים (cp. on גדל, vii. 49, and on גדול, Gen. xv. 18).

3. The idea underlying *vv.* 25-36 is somewhat like that which is implied in Ezra vii. 25 *f.* There are Jews, not only in the district of Jerusalem, but in the old territory of Judah

regarded as a whole, and it appears that this territory included part of the N. Arabian borderland. The reason for suggesting this is that we have already found reason (see *Crit. Bib.* on Josh. and *The Veil*) to think that many of the tribal place-names were originally attached to localities in that region. Not to dwell on other names, it is at least possible that there was a 'ravine of Hinnom' in the S. borderland as well as near Jerusalem (*Crit. Bib.* p. 419). The original form of the name may well have been גֵּיא חַמָּן, where ח׳ will be an offshoot of ירחמאל (p. 67). For גי החר׳ see on vi. 2.

Chap. xii. In *v.* 11 note the names יוידע and ידוע. The former does not properly mean 'Yahwè knows,' nor does the latter mean 'known' (*E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 56). ידע is a well-attested southern clan-name. Cp. the Yeraḥme'elite name ידע, 1 Chr. ii. 28. It was carried far away to northern regions (see 'Yada,' and other names, Johns, *Deeds*, iii. p. 420). Also, in *v.* 28 and iii. 22, note archaistic use of *Kikkar* (cp. Part ii. on Matt. iii. 5). *Kikkar* may come from *Eshkar* or *Ashkar* (*The Veil*, p. 30). And in *v.* 42 note 'Elam,' *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el (not the familiar Elam).

Chap. xiii. 1. 'They separated from Israel all the mixed multitude' (*v.* 3). Our study of Ex. xii. 38 will have led us to doubt this interpretation of ערב. Of course, we should point עֵרֶב. Cp. also עֵרֶב, Jer. xxv. 20, l. 37, Ezek. xxx. 5.

So here Ed. Meyer, *Entst.* p. 130 (note 2), but rendering 'Beduins.'

2. 'Tyrians' (*v.* 16)? In harmony with Ezra iii. 7 read וְהַמְצָרִים. This seems to me in the highest degree probable. But even if we keep 'Tyrians,' do not let us acquiesce in דאג (note superfluous א). Of course, we should read ארג, *i.e.* ארגמן, 'purple.' Tyrian purple was famous in antiquity. Note the purple garments of the Midianite kings (Judg. viii. 26). But also there was purple from Arab-Ishmael (Ezek. xxvii. 7). And in Isa. xix. 13 ארגים חורי should be אַרְגְּמַן אש, Ashhurite purple. Also the merchants were not mere hucksters of salt fish, but well-to-do sellers of purple.

3. And now we can hopefully approach another difficulty. The MT. gives, in *v.* 15*b*, ואעיד ביום מכרם ציד, 'and I warned on the day wherein (or, I warned when) they sold victuals.' This is very obscure. Steiner, in his revised edition of Hitzig's *Kleine Propheten*, p. 304, emends, אֶל־יַד מְקוֹם מַכְתֵּשׁ. Clearly, however, the clause has arisen out of a miswritten gloss. ציד represents צרי, *i.e.* צרים, or rather we should detach the closing מ of מכרם (the final forms but slowly became established), and read מצרים. This word ought to stand first; it has become misplaced. מכר, of course, represents רקם, one of the offshoots of ירחם (cp. בית־הכרם and בני קדם), and יום (as often) has come from ים, *i.e.* יָמָן (also written יָוָן, *i.e.*

ירחמאל). עיד, together with ב, represents ערב, 'Arabia.' And lastly, וא represents הוא. Thus we get מצרים הוא עֲרַב יָמָן [רקם], 'Miṣrim, that is, Yamanite Arabia [Reḳem].' 'Reḳem' appears to be a secondary gloss. The gloss, as a whole, refers to צרים[מ] in *v.* 16. It explains where the Miṣrites dwelt. They were not Egyptians, but N. Arabians.

4. We do not expect Philistian women in this context. But there were, no doubt, several Ashdods. See on iv. 7.

CHAPTER V

BOOK OF ESTHER

THE *Book of Esther* is another of the old Jewish romances. Its true character is sufficiently shown by an eminent scholar in a popular way,[1] but of course without discussing the proper names which, as the text stands, are by no means obviously Persian formations. So at least thinks the doyen of our fraternity, Nöldeke. On the other hand, Professor J. H. Moulton makes the somewhat surprising remark,[2] 'We must reckon with the possibility that the names are Persian,' and refers to a recent scholar[3] who rightly recognizes that the question of the possibility of Aryan elements in the O.T. may have passed into a new phase in consequence of the precious finds of Boghaz-keoi. It is, however, still difficult not to see that there is a huge amount of corruption in the names of *Esther*, and that many of the names are but more or less defaced repetitions of the

[1] Nöldeke's well-known volume of Old Testament sketches.

[2] In Hastings, *D.B.*, extra volume.

[3] Scheftalowitz, *Arisches im A.T.*

same names. Moreover, when once it has been proved that the true and original background of other narrative books is N. Arabian, and that the names too are largely N. Arabian, it is inconsistent to adopt a totally different set of presuppositions and of critical methods in *Esther* from those which I hope that I have, in spite of initial errors, successfully used elsewhere.

Whether there are any grains of history in the story, cannot be absolutely decided. It is—as we have seen—perfectly possible that from time to time Jews became grand viziers to N. Arabian kings. Of course, Yeraḥme'elites would be equally eligible to this high office, and Nöldeke thinks that there is something not unskilful, even if fantastic, in the touch whereby Mordecai and Haman are made to inherit an ancient feud. I would, however, venture to ask whether the feud has been quite correctly understood by the commentators. That Haman hates the Jews is certain. But is he really the representative of the primeval Agag? Surely Agāgī (Esth. iii. 1, etc.) should be Agabi (= Aḥ'ābī), and the meaning is that Haman represented the Yeraḥme'elites, who, whether in S. Canaan or in the N. Arabian borderland, were almost constantly hostile to the Israelites.

Thus a duly critical treatment of Haman, 'the Jew's enemy,' connects itself with one of the most interesting of the discoveries which I have

been privileged to make—that of the true meaning of Aḥ'ab. Important enough, too, is it that Haman (הָמָן) has been traced to its source as יַחְמָן (Yaḥman), for we see now that Haman (Yaḥman), in the mind of the narrator, is not primarily a successful individual, but a personification of the Yeraḥme'elite foes of Israel. In 𝔊's additions to the Book of Esther, Haman is strangely called a Μακεδών. This, however, does not really mean a Macedonian. Makedon is a corruption of Rakmān, *i.e.* one belonging to Rakam or Yarḥam (Yeraḥme'el).[1]

We have now to account for 'Mordecai,' and, if possible, for a certain chronological difficulty which has, somewhat precipitately, been judged insuperable. The name seems to mean 'belonging to Marduk.' Marduk, of course, was a Babylonian deity, and we have a place-name, Nebo, which, at first sight, looks like a parallel to Mordecai. But how incredible it is that such a name should enter into a Benjamite genealogy! See also Ezra ii. 2, Neh. vii. 7, where the list of names has no room for a Mordecai (pp. 48 *f.*). For my part I have no doubt as to the right solution of the problem, though I must admit that it raises another problem, not less important. מרדכי has arisen out of ברדדי, *i.e.* one belonging to Bar-Dad.

[1] According to Nöldeke (in his later article), the allusion is to the bitter enmity between the Jews and their Græco-Macedonian neighbours, especially at Alexandria (*E. Bib.* col. 1406).

The same origin may not improbably be given to the famous but ill-understood title 'Baal Marcod.'

But then it would seem as if Haman and Mordecai originally bore names of the same meaning. And this is indeed the fact which covers a new problem. Israel and Yeraḥme'el are enemies; how is this? Both are children of Abraham; how, then, can one Raḥman seek to destroy the other? It is a question which no mere *raconteur* can answer, but only a true spiritual prophet. Unfortunately there is no spiritual or prophetic element in the book before us.

The statement to which I referred in connexion with 'Mordecai' is this—that that eminent leader of the Jews was carried away to Bābel by Nebuchadnezzar in company with Jeconiah, king of Judah (Esth. ii. 5*f.*). This has puzzled chronologists, because it seems to make a Babylonian and a Persian king contemporaries. But the puzzle disappears when we realize that this, like other old Hebrew stories, has been thoroughly re-edited, and provided with a new background. The consequence is that 'Aḥashwerosh' has become transformed from a N. Arabian into a Persian king.[1] In the original story Aḥashwerosh was presumably Ashḥur, to which a marginal gloss was added, viz. Asshur (just as Nebuchad-

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Ahasuerus.'

nezzar was Shanbu-Ḥad,[1] to which perhaps ʿArāb-Ṣōr[2] was added as a gloss). His capital was Shimshan of Arabia,[3] and his queens were, first, Washti, or rather Asshurith,[4] and then Esther, *i.e.* Israelith.[5] The name of Esther's father—Abiḥail (=ʿArāb-Yeraḥme'el)—records the fact that he was an exile in N. Arabia.

The story of the Book of Esther is that of the supplanting of an Asshurite by an Israelite queen and of a Yeraḥme'elite by an Israelite vizier. There is no need to have recourse for an explanation to Elamite mythology. I need only add that 'from India to Cush' (Esth. i. 1) is, of course, wrong. הדו should be הדד. See p. 151 (on Acts ii. 9), and cp. *E. Bib.*, 'India.' Hadad and Kush were both in N. Arabia. Add also that, in iii. 7, 'they cast Pur, that is, the lot'; 'Pur' is probably a corruption of ʿArāb (Arabia). Cp. פרא, Gen. xvi. 12, and *T. and B.*, *ad loc.* A favourite variety of lot must have been called 'Arabia.' This gives the key to 'Urim and Thummim,' *i.e.* 'Asshurites and Ishmaelites.'

[1] See p. 110 (n.[1]).

[2] *Two Religions*, pp. 18, 82, and Index.

[3] שושן הבירה stands in MT., but we should rather read שמשן הערבה. The interchange of ו and מ is well attested. Cp. on Neh. i. 1.

[4] ושתי should probably be אשרית (Aššurith).

[5] From ישראלית; cp. 'Judith.'

CHAPTER VI

BOOK OF JOB

The legend of Aḥikar appears to have arisen in N. Arabia; may we suppose that the legend of Job (Iyyōb) arose there too? At any rate, the name of the hero Iyyōb indicates probably that he lived in that region, for Iyyōb is either a modification of Yobab (an Edomite or Arammite king), or both are corruptions of Aḥ'ab (see pp. 37, 49), which is properly a name of Asshurite N. Arabia. We must, however, admit that the conception of the suffering righteous man was well known at an early date (2000 B.C.) to Babylonian literature.

I now beg leave to record some new corrections of the text which seem to me of more than common interest, and to point the way to a revision of our literary estimate of Job.

1, 2. Thus in Job iii. 5, 8, we should certainly read:

Let the priests of Yaman terrify it,

and

Let the cursers of Yaman execrate it,
Those that have skill to stir up Leviathan.[1]

[1] *T. and B.* p. 6 (n. 3); *Two Religions*, p. 80.

The priests of Yaman were famous for their accomplishments; כמרים is really only a modification of רחמים, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'elites.' Cp. כלבים (temple ministers), from רחבלים, 'Raḥbulites,' and אכרים (sacred chanters)[1] from אשכרים, 'Ashkarites.' Leviathan is the mythic dragon, identified (as its Hebrew name suggests[2]) with the oppressive powers of N. Arabia.

3. Job vi. 6:

Can that which is unsavoury be eaten without salt,
Or is there any taste in the white of an egg?

So Auth. Vers. The text, however, is impossible, and we should almost certainly read:

Can I eat my portion (see 𝔊) with leaves of mallow,
Or drink purslain broth?

('Purslain' should rather be *anchusa*). So the opening of Eliphaz's fine speech is redeemed.[3]

4. Job vii. 6, 'My days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle.' A far-fetched simile! And will ארג bear this meaning? A comparison of Jer. viii. 7, where the migrations of the swift and the crane are referred to, suggests as the true meaning, 'My days are swifter than a crane (עָגוּר).'

[1] See Am. v. 17, and *Two Religions*, p. 189.

[2] לויתן from יחמאל-איתן.

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Purslain,' 'Mallow.'

5, 6. Job ix. 25, 26. In a similar vein of complaint. First, Job's remaining days are swifter, not 'than a runner,' but 'than an ossifrage (מפרע).' Then they pass away 'as the ships of reed (?),' or rather 'like the ospreys' (read הלא עם־עזניות יעברו).[1] We thus get all the three swiftly flying birds of prey grouped together in Lev. xi. 13, Dt. xiv. 12.

7. Job xviii. 14, 'to the king of terrors' (למלך בלהות). Several critics have questioned this, but for want of insight into the popular Jewish religion have missed the right reading. This is, 'to the king Raḥbal' (רחבל = בלהו); cp. Beliar from Yarbal, and see on xxx. 23.

8. Job xxviii. 8*b*. Read, with N. Herz, לא־דָאָה עָלָיו שָׁלָךְ, 'No cormorant darteth upon it.'

9. Job xxx. 4. The former explanations seem to me to be quite impossible (see *E. Bib.* col. 2647). I venture therefore to propose a new one. שרש ורתמים should be הערקים ורתם, and לחמם should be חלמות, *anchusa*, purslain. Read, therefore, omitting duplications and glosses:

Who pluck mallow and the leaves of the *shîaḥ*,
Who gnaw the broom-plants and the purslain.[2]

Surely, a striking and natural description of the utmost poverty.

10. Job xxx. 23. 'And to the house of

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Osprey,' 'Ossifrage.'
[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Juniper.'

meeting for all living.' But כל חי is a very weak expression just here. Read, as also in Gen. iii. 20, ירחמאל. Yeraḥme'el was also God of the underworld; see *T. and B.* p. 64.

11. Job xxxiii. 23. It appears that line 2 is corrupt; 'Interpreter, one among a thousand,' can hardly be right. Should we not trace N. Arabian influence, and, instead of אחד מני אלף, 'one among a thousand' (surely there were not a thousand angels of the presence!), read אַשְׁחוּר יָמָן, Ashḥur-Yaman? See *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 43, 109.

12. Job xlii. 14. 'And the name of the third was, Box-of-eye-paint.' Rather, 'Scent-of-apples (*Re'aḥ tappuḥim*).' The love of Orientals for sweet scents is well known (see pp. 75 *f.*, on Canticles).

CHAPTER VII

SONG OF SOLOMON (?)

'THE finest of Solomon's songs' (i. 1), or rather, perhaps, 'The finest of songs in the style of Salmah.' The 'tent-curtains of Salmah' (so Winckler) are referred to in Cant. i. 5.[1] The primary object of the *Song* was to supply an antidote to sensuous, passionate, transient love. In ii. 7, iii. 5, the 'daughters of Jerusalem' are adjured by Ṣib'onith[2] (= Ashtart) not to take lightly such a grave matter as love. The use of the terms *dōd* (beloved) for the bridegroom, and *dodāh* (beloved) for the bride, and *aḥōth* (sister; see p. 98) for the bride, suggests that the *Song* was based on a popular Adonis-song.[3] If these facts are correct, Ashtart must at one time have represented the principle of love in the divine Triad. It now becomes possible to date the *Song*

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Salmah.'

[2] To this is appended an alternative reading, '[or] by Ar'elith of Ashḥur.' See short paper in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1911.

[3] See *T. and B.* pp. 19 (n. 5), 47, 56; *Two Religions*, p. 381 (n. 3).

somewhat earlier than has been latterly usual, at any rate before, in references to the Divine Company, Ṣib'onith (a title of Ashtart) was transformed into Ṣeba'oth, as in 'Yahwè Ṣeba'oth.'

Our decision as to the date of the *Song* must depend on a preliminary revision of the text. In the article 'Canticles' and in supplementary articles in the *Encycl. Biblica*, I have amassed a large number of corrections, and on the basis of the text thus corrected have decided in favour of a 'post-exilic' date. I remain, however, open-minded, as I have shown by the admission in the preceding paragraph. Whether there are Greek loan-words I have expressed my grave doubts (*E. Bib.*, 'Canticles'), also as to the connexion of the mountains with spices. I have now to open the question whether the Jerusalem of the *Song* was on the site now known as el-Ḳuds, or the southern city of the same or a similar name.[1] I am now obliged to think that the southern Jerusalem is meant. Certainly the place intended was near Gilead, Hermon, and Lebanon, and it seems to have been proved that the southern Jerusalem was near the southern hills and mountains of those names. It will, I think, help the reader if I quote a paragraph from my article on this subject (*E. Bib.*, 'Canticles'):

'The fondness of the poet of Canticles for spices led the ancient scribes into some very

[1] *The Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 26, 30, and see Index.

strange textual errors — viz. (1) iv. 6, "to the mountains of myrrh (המר) and the hill of frankincense" (הלבונה), where המר should be חרמון, "Hermon," and לבונה should be הלבנון (cp. 𝔊^{BNA}); very probably, also, the correct reading in *v.* 8 is "from the hills of the cedars, from the mountains of the cypresses" (מגבעות ארזים מהררי ברושים); (2) viii. 14, in "the mountains of spices" (בשמים), בש׳ should certainly be ברושים, to which, if Wellhausen's view of הרי בתור, "mountains of malobathron" (*Prolegomena*,[3] p. 409), was that of the early scribes, we may add ii. 17, where we should read הרי ברתים, "mountains of cypresses" (see "Bether")."[1]

I will here confess that I have not seen Mr. W. W. Cannon's work on the *Song*, nor do I know what line he has taken on the general question of the state of the text or on these disputable passages in particular. In the extensive article or monograph from which I have quoted, and in the supplementary articles, such as 'Ebony,' 'Purple,' and especially 'Litter,' Mr. Cannon may have found points to criticize or question. In the last-mentioned article there is a translation of Song iii. 7 *ff.*, to which I still adhere in the main, and which I am prepared to uphold. A few important additions, however, have to be made. In *v.* 7 ששים is certainly superfluous, both metric-

[1] *E. Bib.* col. 693 Unless בתר should be 'Pethor' or 'Pathros.'

ally and otherwise; but how did it come there? It is surely a corruption of חמשים, which in turn is a corruption of רמשחים, 'Ramshaḥites,' *i.e.* the royal body-guard (*Two Religions*, p. 303).—In *v.* 10, just as ארגמן should be אלמגים, so אהבה should be אחאב (*Two Religions*, p. 228), here used for a kind of timber brought from the mountains of Ashḥur-'Arāb, and also called *hobnim* (הבנים or הובנים).—Verse 10 is closed by מבנות ירושלם. This is absurd; but how did it get in? Read מגבעות ישמעאל, 'from the hills of Ishmael (= N. Arabia).' A gloss on 'Ah'ab-wood.'

I need only add (1) that, in *v.* 8, בלילות should be ירחבל (= ירחמאל). Solomon was not thought of as a craven. The 'fear' (פחד) was from Yeraḥme'elite robbers. And (2) that, in *v.* 9, אפריון comes from עֵרֶב יָוָן, a gloss on ירחבל (cp. Cooke, *North Sem. Inscr.* Index), underlying בלילות. On the important question whether Dr. Driver was right in supposing the *Song* to be a drama, though not produced on the stage, I have nothing further to say here. Mr. Cannon apparently agrees with the Professor. The wind of critical opinion blows from a fresh quarter.

CHAPTER VIII

PROVERBS AND ECCLESIASTES

THE Yeraḥme'elite wisdom was famous and many-sided; it is probable that those who cultivated it set the models in some respects for the Aramæan Aḥiḳar, and for the Biblical Hebrew Books of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. In particular, we seem to gather this from the headings (such as 'Proverbs of Salmah')[1] in Prov. x. 1, xxx. 1, xxxi. 1,[2] and possibly from the epilogue of Ecclesiastes. In Eccles. xii. 11 we have, as it seems to me, both a general and a particular statement of no slight importance concerning the Hebrew proverbs. It should probably run nearly thus: 'The sayings of the wise are as goads, as nails firmly driven. The citizens of Pathros have given them—the sons of Ashḥur.' It will, I hope, be recognized that after the general statement which opens *v.* 11 there are a number of words which are highly suspicious and call for textual correction. בעלי אספות, for instance, what

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Salmah'; Wellhausen, *Prol.*[3] p. 225 (note).

[2] *E. Bib.*, 'Massa.'

can that mean? Nothing has been said in the context about collections of proverbs such as may be found in the canonical Book of Proverbs and in fragments in Ecclesiastes itself. The text must therefore be incorrect, and underneath בעלי אספות may lie something analogous to משלי שַׁלְמָה. Where, then, was the accepted home of Yeraḥme'elite wisdom? Within 'the tent-curtains of Salmah'? But this would be almost too conventional; not in tents, but in spacious guest-chambers, the sessions (Arabic *mejlis*) of the Arabian sages were held. Of these sages Balaam (Bil'am) was the type. His home is said to have been at Pethor, but this was certainly a corruption of Pathros, which was not in Egypt but in N. Arabia.[1] בני הזהר ('my son, take warning') is not less extraordinary and unnatural. But it is far from hopeless to correct it. Parallelism supplies a clue; we should read בְּנֵי אשחור, 'the sons of Ashḥur.' הזהר, like זרח (Gen. xxxvi. 13) and יצהר (Ex. vi. 18), comes from אַשְׁחֻר. Then come the glosses. רעה אחד ('one shepherd') is a geographical note; we should restore ערב אשחור, 'Arabia of Ashḥur.' So is ויתר מהמה, *i.e.* הוא אשתר ירחם, 'that is Ashtar[2]-Yarḥam.' Ashtar and Yeraḥme'el are common in old Hebrew for N. Arabia.

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 189*f.*; *Two Religions*, p. 89.

[2] ש is often omitted, *e.g.* אחר above, also יתר and יתרו. Erbt's comparison of the Bab. *atru*, 'wise,' neglects analogies (*Sicherstellung des Monotheismus*, p. 30).

Surely the Yeraḥme'elites cannot have been as bad as the Israelite prophets paint them. Nor, surely, can their God and their Goddess have been altogether unworthy of their position, and unqualified to lift their people up to stage upon stage of moral and spiritual enlightenment. An endeavour has been made in my *Traditions and Beliefs* to shake the prevalent prejudice against what one of its enemies denominates Baalism.

The worshippers of the God variously called Asshur, Yeraḥme'el, and Ba'al, and of the Goddess of many titles, best known to us as Ashtart, must have held commemoration or benediction services in honour of their deity. It is possible that one such eulogy (or virtual eulogy) has been preserved to us in Prov. viii. 22-31. It wears the outward form of a monologue of divine Wisdom, and opens with the words:

Yahwè produced me as the beginning of his way,
Before his works of old.

It is true, the Former of divine Wisdom is, not Yeraḥme'el, but Yahwè. But originally he was, not Yahwè, but Yeraḥme'el, as we see from the predilection she (*i.e.* Wisdom) evinces for her N. Arabian worshippers.

Many scholars are of opinion that this fine personification of Wisdom is a late importation from Iran or from Babylon.[1] But why the

[1] Bousset, *Rel. des Jud.* (2) p. 592; *Probleme der Gnosis*, p. 336; Cheyne, *Kohut Studies*, p. 112; Zimmern, *KAT*, pp. 432, 439.

Yeraḥme'elites or the Judaites should not have worshipped or reverenced a Wisdom-goddess, it is difficult to understand; indeed, it is possible to hold that the creative goddess preceded the creative god. Referring for the evidence to the work already mentioned, I venture to quote two sentences from the same book.

'Divine Wisdom, he says, was the assessor of the Most High at creation, but in spite of this, no sooner were the N. Arabian lands in existence than Wisdom chose to concentrate her favour on the N. Arabian peoples. . . .

'And now that creation is finished, is Wisdom's occupation gone? No, truly. Henceforth it devolves upon the Creator's assessor, standing before his works, to interpret the creative words. But none of her delights can exceed that which she has in her chosen land of Ishmael and her chosen people of Aram.'[1]

[1] *T. and B.* p. 39.

CHAPTER IX

BOOK OF TOBIT

THE varied nature of the contents of *Tobit* has been well set forth by the latest commentator in Dr. Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*. 'Popular religion,' he says, 'and magical speculation, current mythology and demonology, ethical and moral maxims of his day, traditional folklore and romantic legend, all contributed their quota to the education of the author. They widened his outlook on life without vitiating the spirituality of his religion or the reality of his adhesion to Judaism.' Deservedly the unknown author exercised great influence both on Jewish and on Jewish-Christian society. The perception of a N. Arabian background does not interfere with these admissions.

Ample, however, as Mr. Simpson's introduction and commentary are, they are marked by one great omission, nothing being said on the question whether the story of Tobit may not, like other narratives, have been remodelled so as to present a new background. For my part, I am strongly

of opinion that this remodelling is a fact. We have, I think, to discuss this in connexion with another question as to the original background of certain sections of 2 Kings. If the conquerors there spoken of were N. Arabian, we may reasonably presume that the original background of the Book of Tobit was altogether N. Arabian. My own conclusion is that the King of Asshur spoken of in 2 K. xvii. 6 is a N. Arabian king, and it only remains to test this result by its consistency with the details of the Tobit-story. Constant comparison of Prof. Moulton's *Early Zoroastrianism* will be useful. I remain, however, unconvinced.

Tobit i. 1-6. Tobit is here represented as the son of Tobiel, *i.e.* Ethbaʿal (cp. 'the land of Tob,' Judg. xi. 3, and 'Ish-tob,' *i.e.* Asshur-Ethbaʿal, 2 S. x. 6); also as of the (southern) tribe of Naphtali, where Napht comes from Nabt, *i.e.* Ethban (= Ethbal[1]); *al* in Naphtali is a formative ending. His town or township was Tisbé, *i.e.* perhaps Shabʿith,[2] a title of Astart; see below. What we know further of the birthplace of Tobit is that it was also the reputed birthplace of the prophet Elijah (2 K. xvii. 3), and that it was to the south of Kedesh-Naphtali, a well-known city in Galilee, above Asher. One notes in passing

[1] *Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 86 *f.* Cp. Nebat, 1 K. xi. 26, and perhaps Yepheth (Japheth), Gen. v. 32, and Yiftaḥ, Judg. xi. 1; and see *The Veil*, etc., p. 145.

[2] *Two Religions*, pp. 125, 276.

that the original Galil (Galilee) and Gal'ad or Gal'ar (from Gal and 'Ar = 'Arāb)[1] were hardly in accordance with the later geography, also that the traditions of Tobit's house were not of the strictest Yahwistic order. In fact, in the days of his youth the whole tribe of Naphtali fell away from the strict worship of Yahwè as practised in the temple of Jerusalem, and sacrificed to Baal or Ashtart.[2] Tobit himself claims to have been the only exception, because he alone went often to Jerusalem at the feasts, 'as it was ordained' (*v.* 6); this, however, is inconsistent with v. 13. Still, neither Tobit nor Ananias could escape sharing in the national doom; the whole of Naphtali[3] was carried away into the N. Arabian land of Asshur, the capital of which was Yewānāh[4] (corrupted into Nineveh), 'in the days of Shalman-eser (so read!), king of the Asshurites' (*v.* 2).

Tobit i. 9-14. Tobit's marriage to a woman of his kinsfolk was in accordance with the law against mixed marriages. He was equally strict about his food. Asshur being an unclean land (Hos. ix. 3) he refrained his 'soul (appetite)' from

[1] Gal = Yeraḥme'el (cp. Regel, Isa. xli. 2; *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 86; En-Rogel, 2 S. xvii. 17; *The Veil*, p. 59). Note that the second element in Gil'ad or Gal'ad is altered by the popular caprice from *'ar* into *'ad*.

[2] Ba'al (= Ethba'al = Ishmael) and Ashtart, with perhaps the addition of Yahwè, formed a divine duad or triad.

[3] The exaggeration is obvious.

[4] Corrupted into Nineveh (see on xiv. 4). Cp. *The Two Religions*, pp. 403 *f.*; *T. and B.* p. 188.

eating the bread of his captors (*vv.* 10-12). Nevertheless Israel's God made him so attractive in character that Shalman-eser appointed him purveyor to the royal household. Now, it so fell out that, in the course of his business, he had to visit the land of Madai, where he left in trust ten talents of silver with a fellow-Israelite named Gabael (*i.e.* one belonging to Agab, or Ashḥur-ʿArāb); the name also appears in the genealogy of Tobit (i. 1). As a place-name we should take note of Rages in the N. Arabian land of Madai,[1] where Gabael resided; like Gabael, it is a record of the wide diffusion of the migratory Yeraḥme'elites. One of the shortened forms of Yeraḥme'el is Regel (see note below); another is Regem (Zech. vii. 2, see p. 10). Still further shortened forms are Gal and Rag; Rag is the first element in Rages (as also in the personal name Raguel, iii. 7), and Ash (*i.e.* Asshur) seems to be the second. I may say at once that I differ from Prof. J. H. Moulton, who regards this as based on a Median folk-story.

Tobit i. 15-22. The accession of a new Asshurite king had an injurious effect on the fortunes of Tobit, so that he could no longer go into Madai on his business. Sennacherib (Ishman-Reḥôb?) was a wrathful, passionate man, and after his flight from the land of Israel put many to death who belonged to the sacred people. Tobit,

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 159 *ff.*; *The Veil*, p. 102.

however, in accordance with a principle which had long guided his conduct (*v.* 17), buried the dead bodies of his countrymen privily, so that, when the king made inquiry about them, they were not to be found (*v.* 18). An Asshurite of the capital therefore accused Tobit to the king, who sought to put him also to death. All, however, that the king could do (for Tobit succeeded in making his escape) was to confiscate Tobit's goods. The punishment was not long delayed. Not five-and-fifty years had passed when 'two of his sons killed him,' and they fled into the mountains of Ashtar (*v.* 21, see below).

So, then, the Asshurites were not humane enough to bury the corpses of men of a different cult from themselves. There seems to have been a general feeling among the N. Arabian races that the fate of a man after death depended on his having received due funeral rites, and especially that of burial, either in a cave or in the clods of the valleys. 'The kings of nations, all of them, lie in glory, each one in his house' (Isa. xiv. 18). Plebeians too are at least housed, even if meanly, in the streets of the city of Death. But the shades of those who in their lifetime opposed the great God Asshur (for instance) and were exclusive Yahwists, will not be released from their mutilated corpses till some one casts these corpses, and many more with them, into some deep pit (Isa.

xiv. 19). Such at least was the Asshurite form of the N. Arabian view.

The reason why Tobit was so careful to bury the dead bodies of Israelites will now be clear. Without such burial their share in the resurrection to life would be imperilled. One remembers that in Isa. xxvi. 19 the summons to rise is only addressed to those who dwell in 'dust,' not to those who are 'cast out of their grave, like an abhorred plant' (Isa. xiv. 19). If we compare the passages from the ode of triumph over the king of (the N. Arabian) Bābel with the account of the conduct of the Asshurite king in Tobit i. 18*f.*, we shall probably agree that the underlying ideas are very similar. Nor can I now see any reason to suppose that the Israelite belief in the importance of burial for the imminent resurrection of faithful Israelites unto life was decisively influenced by any Zoroastrian or pre-Zoroastrian belief on these subjects.[1]

Verse 21 contains several confusing corruptions, especially 'Ararat' for 'Ashtar,'[2] 'Sacherdon(os)' for 'Asshur-Rakkon,'[3] and 'Acheikar(os)' for 'Ashkur-Rekem.' A few lines on the last of these names are not unnecessary, considering the confidently urged theory of the learned historian

[1] See, however, Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism.*

[2] *T. and B.* p. 146.

[3] Rakkon became Kedon. 'Rak,' the short for Rekem = Yarḥam.

Professor Eduard Meyer. I venture myself to think that 'the Brother is dear' is impossible, and that the onomatological scheme on which this is based is hardly worthy of support. Never surely was a god styled 'The Brother,' and, in general, professions of faith such as 'the Brother is precious' or 'God is good,' even if comparatively ancient, are later inventions. The right view is that this is a shortened form for Ashḥur, Ab or Abi the short for 'Eber = 'Arāb, and Ḥamu or Ḥami the short for Yarḥam = Yeraḥme'el ; also that Kar and Ḳar are the short for Rekem or Yarḥam. The Yarḥamites were famous for wisdom (1 K. v. 30 *f.* ; Baruch iii. 23), and their representative, among other names, fitly bore the name Aḥiḳar (Ashhur-Yarḥam), indicating thereby the region from which the wisdom of the Semitic races largely proceeded. It will be noticed that Tobit is partly modelled on Aḥiḳar, whose moral wisdom he has assimilated ; also that Aḥiḳar's servant, in the Armenian version of the legend, is called Beliar, a name which certainly comes from Yarbel, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el.

The anachronism involved in making Aḥiḳar a contemporary of Tobit[1] did not trouble the narrator, nor had he any scruple in converting

[1] If, however, the whole of *Tobit* is by one person, we must admit that the author is not consistent with himself, for in xiv. 10 Achiacharos is referred to as a legendary personage, whereas in i. 22, ii. 10, xi. 18, he is the most distinguished member of the family of Tobit, who calls him 'my brother's son.'

Aḥiḳar into an Israelite of high rank at the Asshurite court. According to the writer, he combined the offices of cup-bearer (cp. Nehemiah), keeper of the signet, steward, and overseer of the accounts (*v.* 22); or, to be brief, he was appointed to be next unto the king, like Joseph of old (Gen. xli. 40)—in a word, to be grand vizier.

Tobit ii.–iii. 6. Achiacharos, who has just been introduced to us as the highest in rank at the Asshurite court, now ventured to intercede for his Israelite kinsmen. So this model family were reunited in their home at Yewānāh—Tobit, his wife Anna, and his son Tobias. Needless to say, Tobit resumed his course of righteous alms-giving and charity towards his needy fellow-Israelites in a strange land. His wife, however, was not worthy of her husband. 'Where are thine alms and thy righteous deeds?' (*v.* 14*b*) she asked. It seemed to her as if God had turned against His servant, and that an immoral God justified immorality in His worshipper. That was, in fact, the position taken up by Job's wife (Job ii. 9*f.*); the blindness of Tobit (ii. 9*f.*) corresponds with the elephantiasis of Job, and the practical atheism of that patriarch's wife to the same psychic condition of Tobit's Anna. Tobit seeks refuge in prayer; he petitions to be 'delivered (by death) out of this distress, and go into the everlasting place,' but is so thoroughly pious as to admit that God 'judgeth truly and justly for ever' (iii. 1-6).

Not the least interesting part of this section is the statement in ii. 10*b* that Tobit was nourished by Achiacharos two years, till the latter went to Elymais. Why to Elymais? The current story of Aḥiḳar would rather have suggested Egypt. The answer is that in the earlier form of the story the king under whom Aḥiḳar worked was an Asshurite, but the king to whom he journeyed was king of the N. Arabian Miṣrim; and further that 'Elymais,' *i.e.* Elam, was a district of N. Arabia (see on Ezra ii. 31). More definiteness is impossible, but the existence of the 'Asshurite Elam' can hardly any longer be denied.

Tobit iii. 7-17. It was not only Tobit who 'heard false reproaches.' On the same day Sara, daughter of Raguel,[1] residing (but the names have been altered) in Ecbatana, a city of Media, was also 'reproached' by her father's maids. Ecbatana is altered from Aḥmetha[2] (see Ezra vi. 2), which the translator (in accordance with the new historical theory) identified with Ecbatana. Madai, as we have seen, is not Media, but primarily a N. Arabian regional. It will be shown presently that Madai also forms part of the name of the powerful demon אשמדי or Asmodæus.

And what were the 'reproaches' which so

[1] See p. 10.

[2] See on Ezra vi. 2 (p. 24).

greatly affected Sara that, like Tobit in like circumstances, she besought Israel's God that she might die? I will endeavour to answer the question, remarking, however, first of all that Sara's petition for death is coupled with an alternative—'but if it please thee not that I should die, command some regard to be had of me, and pity taken of me, that I hear no more reproach' (*v.* 15).

In iii. 8 two accounts are recorded: (1) that the fiend Asmodæus or (see Moulton, *E.Z.* p. 251) Asmodaus had killed, one after another, seven husbands before they had each left the marriage chamber; and (2) that Sara herself had done to death these seven persons by strangling them. The second alternative is plainly the fiction of a person who had thrown off the belief in Asmodæus; it is an arbitrary alteration of the original story.

Asmodæus is often thought to be one of the evil spirits taken over by Zarathushtra from the earlier Iranian religion, and traced to Aeshma-daeva. This compound name, however, does not occur in our Avestan texts, and lustfulness is no characteristic of the potent prince Aeshma ('Wrath'). Asmodæus, or rather Asmodaus, can only be explained on the analogy of Ashkenaz. It is a Græcized form of Ashmadai (Asshur-Madai), and denotes the tutelary divinity of N. Arabia. It was hardly charitable of the creator of the Tobit story to convert the not wholly

unworthy goddess-consort of Baal-Ashtar into the lustful demon Asmodæus.

The story further tells us that when, through Raphael, the demon had smelt a certain overpowering smell, he fled into the upper parts of Egypt (so the Greek), where the angel bound him (Tobit viii. 3). According to Mr. Simpson, this was suggested by the Egyptian story of the Possessed Princess. It is perhaps natural that he should think so, but not this way lies the true solution of the problem.

For it is but too probable that we have been taken in by early editors whose aims and critical principles were different from our own, and who have consistently altered Miṣraim (Egypt) into Miṣrim (the name of a part of N. Arabia). We may, I think, fitly illustrate our passage by Isa. xiv. 13 and Ps. Sol. ii. 30. In the former passage the king of the N. Arabian Bābel[1] (= Rakbal) boastingly says that he will 'sit on the mount of assembly (?), in the utmost parts of Ṣaphon (= Ṣi'b'on[2]).' It appears that the mountain where the gods dwelt was popularly supposed to be in a distant part of N. Arabia. And so we may reasonably suppose that, according to the underlying original text of Tobit viii. 3, Asmodæus 'fled into the utmost parts of (the N. Arabian)

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 185 *f.*; *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 16, 105.

[2] *T. and B.* p. 50 (n. 3); *Decline and Fall*, p. 42; *Two Religions*, p. 375.

Miṣrim,' where he had been wont to dwell among the great N. Arabian gods. He found, however, more than his match in the prince-angel Raphael.

The other passage needs to be similarly restored, if we are to gain a really probable understanding of it. It states poetically, not that Pompey, but that the mythic dragon, representing Israel's N. Arabian oppressor, would be 'slain on the mountains of Miṣrim.' It is an interesting passage,[1] as showing that the Hebrew poets did not altogether neglect to mention the mountainous character of the land of Miṣrim.

That there were Egyptian as well as N. Arabian and Israelite stories based on a belief in demoniacal possession, need not surprise us. Such an one is the Egyptian story of the Possessed Princess on the Bentres style. Indeed, wherever the belief in demons was a living force, stories about a Stronger than the strong must have been in circulation. Of course, in the original story much more must have been made of the 'binding' of Asmodæus than we find in our Tobit.

We now return to the story which the editor and the translator have handed on. Both prayers were heard 'before the Majesty of the Great God' (*v.* 16), and the twofold mission of Raphael was the practical result. Raphael was one of

[1] Point מִצְרַיִם, and just before read, underneath τοῦ εἰπεῖν, ירחמאל, a gloss. See p. 95 (n. 1).

the prince-angels. His name was no doubt understood in later times as 'God heals.' Originally, however, it must have belonged to a Yeraḥme'elite deity, and have had the form 'Araphel = 'Arābel, *i.e.* 'belonging to Arabia.'

Chap. iv. Note that Tobit's first paternal charge to his son Tobias indicates the vast importance attached to orderly burial (see pp. 86 *f.*). Next, and surely not inferior in importance, is the honouring of the mother. Then comes another section of the charge (which was originally not intended for its present position), relative to the exclusive worship of Yahwè, to the performance of His law, to almsgiving (cp. i. 3), to marrying within the tribe, to the punctual payment of wages, to the 'Golden Rule,' to temperance in wine-drinking, to alms (repeated), to 'pouring out thy bread and thy wine on the burial-places of the righteous,' and to 'asking counsel of all that are wise.'

Vv. 6*b* - 19*a* are 'full of reminiscences of Aḥiḳar' (Simpson). See introduction, in Charles, i. 192. Is this due to pre-Christian interpolation? At any rate there is no reason why Aḥiḳar should not be borrowed from, for the N. Arabians (as 1 K. iv. 31 shows) were tutors of the Israelite sages; and (as Isa. xix. 11 demonstrates) the Miṣrite wisdom was of immemorial antiquity. Now Miṣrim was doubtless one of the 'kingdoms of Yeraḥme'el,' *i.e.* was N. Arabian, so that

Aḥiḳar naturally went there to offer his stores of wisdom to the king.

I do not, however, feel able to admit that Tobit iv. 17 is rightly read and rightly explained by Rendel Harris (Charles, ii.) and by Simpson (*ibid.* i. 212). A reference to a primitive and questionable funeral rite suits neither the context nor the parallel line. The zeugma in 'Pour out thy bread and thy wine' is also scarcely tolerable. It is true, in the story of Aḥiḳar, as given in the Arabic and Syriac versions (Ar. and Syr. A), there are parallels to the Greek of *Tobit.* Both, in fact, render:

My son! pour out thy wine on the graves of the righteous,
And drink not with evil (ignorant) men.

But here, too, the context is opposed to this view of *a*, and corruption may be strongly suspected in the text on which these versions of Aḥiḳar are based. Certainly the original text of Tobit iv. 17 ran:

Stretch out, O Yeraḥme'el, thy hand for a blessing to the righteous,
Neither give unto sinners.[1]

Yeraḥme'el means here the N. Arabian audience

[1] Read, שלח ירחמאל ידך לברכת צדיקים | ואל תתן לחטאים. In explanation note that לחסך which the Greek text presupposes (like לאמר, Jer. iii. 1, etc.) represents רחמל, *i.e.* ירחמאל. קברת (see Greek) has sprung from ברכת.

addressed in the collection of *meshalim* or wise utterances from which Tobit iv. 6*b*-19*a* appears to be extracted. The context speaks of almsgiving; *v.* 17*a* supplements this by a paternal advice to the writer's spiritual children not to spend money on the undeserving, but to 'stretch out the hand for a blessing (*i.e.* present) to the righteous.' This seems to me a genuine and important restoration of the original Hebrew.

The close of the parental charge relates to a piece of business which naturally devolved on the son of the house. This was to reclaim the ten talents of silver, which Tobias had left in trust with Gabael the brother of Gabri at Rages-Madai (*v.* 20). The names are not unimportant. They prove, as I have pointed out, the wide diffusion of the migratory N. Arabian race, but in the first instance they confirm the view that the Jews were very widely spread throughout N. Arabia. Gabael, as we have seen already, is 'one who belongs to Aḥ'ab,'[1] and similarly Gabri (= Gabri'el) is 'one who belongs to Aḥ'ab-'Arāb.'[2] In this connexion we may notice that the river beside which the travellers lodge, though called Tigris, is no doubt the Ḥiddekel of Genesis and Daniel, which was early identified with the Tigris,

[1] *T. and B.* p. 63 (n. 4); *Two Religions*, pp. 228, 240.

[2] Gabri is almost certainly from Gab-Bari. Gab is an abridged form of Agab = Aḥ'ab; Bar is from Rab = 'Arāb. Cp. Mika'el = Yeraḥme'el. Both prince-angels are patrons of Israel.

in spite of critical and philological objections.[1] Really it seems to represent the compound name Ḥadad-Gilead,[2] which records the fact (which, in the absence of a sketch of the geography of ancient Palestine and N. Arabia, we can but assume) that the river referred to bounded the district known as Ḥadad-Gilead.

But what was the party that lodged by the 'ancient river,' and how did its members come together? The party consisted of only two persons,—Tobias the son of Tobit, and one in the semblance of a young man who professed to be a kinsman of Tobit who was seeking employment. He it was who volunteered to accompany Tobias to Gabael 'our kinsman's' house. Really he was none less than Raphael, the angel of God, but this information he kept back till his work on earth should be finished. This was how Tobias and his guide came together.

There is one of the travellers, however, whom I have not mentioned—Tobias's dog:[3] 'And the dog went forth with him and journeyed with them,' vi. 2 (1); the spirit seems Hellenic. The adventure with the fish need not be here mentioned, nor the conversation between Tobias and the angel respecting the marriage, which it was Tobias's 'happy duty' to contract (Simpson, p. 196). It is more important, however, to notice

[1] *T. and B.* p. 89. [2] *Ibid.* p. 456 (n. 1).
[3] *Traditions and Beliefs*, pp. 194 *f.*

an at first sight strange title given in *v.* 22 (21) by Tobit to his wife, in vii. 15 (16) by Raguel to his wife, and in viii. 4, 7 by Tobias to his bride Sara—'sister.' This title, as is well known, was often given in old Egyptian songs to married women. The question therefore arises whether it is due to Egyptian influence that in Tobit and in the Song of Songs (iv. 9, 10, 12) the same term is applied to a bride or a wife. The answer seems to be that 'brother' and 'sister' were terms both in Egypt and in Palestine, and, perhaps one may add, in N. Arabia, for membership in a family (*gens*) or in the nation. There is no need on this occasion to suppose a Palestinian writer to have borrowed from Egypt.

We next hear of the arrival and welcome of the travellers by Raguel at Ecbatana as leading on to the marriage. This reminds one of a similar episode in the traditional story of Jacob, and is devoid of any special interest for the critic. We must make an exception, however, for this remarkable passage, already referred to:

'And Tobias remembered the words of Raphael, and took the liver of the fish and the heart out of the bag which he had, and put them on the ashes of the incense. And the smell of the fish baffled the demon, and he ran away into the upper parts of Egypt; and Raphael went and fettered him there, and bound him straightway' (vii. 2, 3; Simpson).

I am bound to mention that Mr. Simpson's argument here seems to me very weak. He thinks that 'the binding of Asmodæus in Upper Egypt . . . expresses the author's conviction that Egypt, where he was compelled to live in exile, was the veritable dumping-ground of wickedness and sin, exactly as Zechariah regarded Babylon, the land of exile he knew best, . . . as the goal of the flying Ephah, wherein Wickedness was imprisoned (Zech. v. 5-11).' But surely the author cannot be supposed to have differed from the generality of Jews, who (as I have repeatedly proved) regarded the N. Arabian Bābel as the centre of false religion. If he says 'the upper parts of Miṣrim,' rather than 'of Bābel,' that is because he has in view the N. Arabian mountains, and the city called Bābel was apparently not a mountain-city. With 'the upper parts of Miṣrim we may compare Psalms of Solomon ii. 30, where the mythic dragon is said to have been "slain on the mountains of Miṣrim."'[1]

Asmodæus, then, is foiled and punished. Nevermore will he and his company trouble the people of Yahwè-worshippers. Raphael, however, the disguised prince-angel, has still to take part in a business transaction. This he does, and with

[1] See further in my review of Charles's *Pseudepigrapha* in *Review of Theology* (ed. Menzies), section on 'Psalms of Solomon.'

Tobias returns to the sorrowing Tobit and Anna. To reach Nineveh (the original text, however, had Yewānāh) they had to pass by a place called —probably—Ashkari[1] (Asshur-Reḳem). It was here that Raphael suggested to his companion that it would be well for them two to run in advance of Sara to prepare the house while they were coming. So they two went together, and the dog followed them.[2] Now Raphael had told Tobias what to do, that his father might recover his sight. When, therefore, Tobit stumbled as he went to the door, Tobias lost no time in stepping forward with his remedy. He first blew into his poor blind father's eyes (vi. 12), then he took hold of him with an encouraging word; then he 'threw the medicament upon him, and gave it him; and he pulled off the white films with both his hands from the corners of his eyes.' The cure was complete. 'And he fell upon his neck and wept, and said to him, I see thee, child, light of mine eyes. And he said, Blessed is God, and blessed is his great Name, and blessed are all his holy angels . . . for he did chastise me, and

[1] See various readings, Charles, i. 229. Underneath lies אשכרי. For Ashkar or Ashḳar, see *Traditions and Beliefs*, p. 380; *The Veil*, pp. 30, 53.

[2] R^{e}, however, made the dog run before the party (cp. V, *et quasi nuntius adveniens*; an interesting notice of Simpson's in Charles, i. 195). If *Tobit* were 'unmistakably' a Median folk-tale, this pretty feature would have to be abandoned. At least, the four-eyed dog who drove away the corpse-fiend (Moulton) would hardly become one of the family.

behold, I see my son Tobias.' Tobias too was not behindhand; the description is very fine—'rejoicing and blessing God in his whole body' (cp. Ps. ciii. 1). Then, after reporting the success of his journey, Tobias allowed his father to go unattended to the gate of Yewanah (MT. Nineveh) to meet his daughter-in-law, Sara. There, as was seemly, benedictions flowed again, and all the Jews of Yewanah rejoiced. Last of all we are told that 'Aḥiḳar and his cousin Nabath came rejoicing unto Tobit' (xi. 18).

It is this latter notice which specially interests us. Here, like Syr. in ii. 10, the Syriac and the Vulgate represent Aḥior, probably a modified form of Ashḥur.[1] If so, the narrator on whom both depend may well have known that Aḥiḳar was N. Arabian. It is altogether less conceivable that Aḥior should be a corruption of Aḥiḳar. There is also another disputable name. It is doubtful whether the name of Aḥiḳar's kinsman and companion was Nabad or Nadab or Nabath or Nasbas (from Manasseh?). Simpson accepts Nadab; it is better, however, to read Nabath, which, like Naboth and Nebat, will come from Ethban;[2] Nabad and Nabath will be parallel to Gilead and Galath.[3]

Chap. xii. is in some respects very remarkable.

[1] Cp. אחר from אַשְׁחֻר often.

[2] *Decline and Fall*, p. 150 (n. 1); *Veil*, pp. 86 *f.*

[3] *Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 116 (n. 2), 137 *f.*

It consists partly of a fresh group of maxims of practical religion relating to thanksgiving, prayer, and alms, partly of information respecting Raphael. The tendency to revert to the hortatory standpoint is characteristic of the author and his age, and, as we have seen, was fostered by the reading of Aḥiḳar. The peculiarity, however, of the maxims and exhortations of chap. xii. is that they are put into the mouth of "one of the seven angels, who stand and enter before the glory of the Lord" (*v.* 15). I cannot avoid returning to the subject of the prince-angels to whom Raphael belongs. The 'angels of the Face' are variously named; their number, too, is various. We cannot take upon ourselves to assert dogmatically how many of these heavenly Powers there were in Semitic peoples; nor which of the name-lists is most correct. We may, however, assert, with a high degree of probability, that in the age of developing dualism, when Yahwè and Belial or Satan represented, the one the good and the other the evil (or rebellious) principle, it was believed (with the sanction of the religious authorities) that the good God and the bad god had each a group of courtiers. The names of the courtiers on both sides were adopted from the names or titles which had been borne by the members of the divine triads (other than Yahwè) in Palestine and N. Arabia. Such titles were commonly significant of the districts where the divinities in

question were originally worshipped; one of them was Mikael, another Gabriel, another Raphael, another Uriel. These, or others in the same company, presided (as we may suppose) over the four corners of the earth, which, in primitive times, were specially sacred. The double evolution of Asshur and Yeraḥme'el (the subordinate companions of Yahwè in olden times) is one of the most remarkable facts of the history of Jewish religion. Raphael and Mikael, Uriel and Beelzebul, came to have different spheres of action, but were originally the same.[1]

Was it usual, however, for prince-angels to go about delivering addresses in the style of the *meshālim*? But why not? In one of his aspects Yahwè was a sage, and certainly the Messiah, 'an angel of the great council'[2] (𝔊, Isa. ix. 3), had not only the spirit of courage but of knowledge. It is true, the authenticity of Tobit iv. 6*b*–17*a*, xii. 6*b*–11, may be questioned, but at any rate the *Wanderschaft* of the prince-angels was not an inadmissible theory in the opinion of the early redactor.

And how did the early Jews think of the

[1] Raphael = Arābel; Mikael = Yeraḥme'el; Gabriel = Aḥ'ab-Rab; Uriel = Asshuriel; Beel-zebul = Baal-Ishmael; Belial = Yeraḥme'el. These explanations are thoroughly methodical, but I can only give the barest results. Cp. *Traditions and Beliefs* for parallels.

[2] Both Yahwè and Belial probably had councils of seven. In Zarathushtra's religion the Amesha Spenta were six.

appearances of prince-angels? Their theory must have been Docetic, *i.e.* they or their spiritual leaders must have been conscious that such theophanies were not based on reality but on illusion (Meyer). Speculating further they must have concluded that the prince-angel whom in human form they had seen partook of no human food, and this is what is expressly stated in xii. It is possible, however, that the whole of this chapter has been more or less expanded or interpolated by a redactor. However this may be, the influence of *vv.* 16-22 on parallel Christian views can hardly be mistaken. It need only be added that chap. xiv. has a general affinity with the Epilogue of the Book of Job. It reveals a spirit of unconquerable optimism. Neither in the Epilogue to Job, nor in Tobit xiv., is there any trace of eschatological system. (Cp. Moulton's *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 252.)

CHAPTER X

THE BOOK OF JUDITH

HERE we have another historical romance designed to inspire the Jews with courage against their social and religious persecutors and oppressors. The true historical setting is approximately as follows. Nebuchadnezzar, here made king of the Asshurites,[1] proclaimed war against the land of Madai, and sent a summons to the dwellers in Pathros (Ṣarephath), Yaman, (Mount) Ḥalak, Ramshaḳ, etc., unto Jerusalem and Ethban and Ashkal, and Kashram and the stream of Miṣrim and Naphtaḥ-Ashḥur and Aram-Asshur, and all the land of Gishron until thou comest to the borders of Kush (i. 7-10). The object of his missive was a combined attack on ʿArāb-Kashram, king of Madai, *i.e.* the union of all the N. Arabian territories, including Judah, under one king (the lord of Asshur) and one

[1] The name of this king—so familiar that I retain it here—should probably rather be Shanbu-Ḥad-ʿArāb-Ṣor. ʿArāb-Ṣor may be a gloss.

God (no other than Nebuchadnezzar himself—see iii. 8). After conquering Madai he entrusted the further task to Holofernes, his general (ii. 4), who, after a successful campaign, encountered the first real resistance at the hands of the Jews, but lately returned from exile (iv. 3). The immediate danger was for the fate of a strong city of the Jews called Bethulia, or rather Ethbaal-Yarḥu (Ishmael-Yeraḥ), another name for which seems to have been Ethbaal-Miṣrim. The high priest Yoiaḳim (Neh. xii. 26), therefore, by letter charged those who dwelt in this city to keep firm hold of the passes. This was carried out, to the great disgust of Holofernes, who straightway called a council of officers of the Moabites and Ammonites, and asked for information respecting the Jews and their country. At this point one Achior (= Ashḥur) appears—'the leader of all the sons of Ammon' (v. 5). He makes a speech in reply, entirely from a Jewish point of view. This speech was greeted with murmurs, and the Asshurite general expressed the official view that Nebuchadnezzar was omnipotent, and therefore divine, and no resistance to his might was possible. What right had Achior to speak discouraging words in a strain only seemly for prophets? This is rather remarkable, because Holofernes, who censures Achior for 'prophesying,' falls himself into the prophetic style. His speech for Nebuchadnezzar

might, *mutatis mutandis*, almost have been spoken by Jeremiah. As a punishment, Achior was cast down, bound, at the foot of the hill on which Bethulia was built. The Jews brought him to their assembly, and a friendly welcome was accorded him. Nevertheless the people compelled their rulers to agree to surrender Bethulia in five days if no help were forthcoming, for the water-supply of the city had been cut off.

In the remainder of the book (viii.-xvi.) the leading figure is a beautiful Jewish widow named Judith, who is clearly the personification of the Jewish, *i.e.* Pharisaic, ideal of righteousness. The rest of the story need not be told here. Before we pass on, however, I wish to point out a few omissions in the current textual criticism on this book. The first passage I shall refer to is in Judith vi. 2, 'And who art thou, Achior, and the hirelings of Ephraim?' But Achior, we are told, was an Ammonite; indeed, just afterwards (*v.* 5), Achior is expressly called 'hireling of Ammon.' The key is to be found in the N. Arabian theory. 'Hirelings of Ephraim' should be 'hirelings of Arabia.' The writer of *Judith* earnestly believes that Arabia too has a future; and if Arabia at present supplies only mercenaries, it will one day furnish proselytes. The Ammonites are Arabians. Read, therefore, 'hirelings of Arabia' (*'arbim* for *'ephra'im*).

2. In Judith iv. 4, vii. 3, 'Bel-maim' should be

'Abel-Yewanim.' Abel, however, in proper names is invariably a modification of Ba'al. Maim for Yewanim, as 2 S. xli. 24. The Syr. identifies with Abel-Meḥolah, where Meḥolah is a fem. form of Ḥamul, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el.

3. In vii. 3 the site near Bel-maim, which in iv. 4 is taken by κωνα, appears to be occupied by κναμων. The former (κωνα) is almost certainly the true reading, being the contracted form of κναμωνα (written $\overline{\text{κωνα}}$) or (preferably) καμμωνα.[1] The latter word (καμμωνα) requires critical explanation. Most probably it comes from Akammon. This, however, can only be an intermediate stage. *Ak* stands, as often, for Ashḥur, and *ammon* for *aḥiman*.[2]

Among the other place-names one thinks, in the first instance, of Bethulia, which Dr. Cowley (in Charles, vol. i.), with Prof. Torrey,[3] identifies with Beth-el, not the well-known city-name, but a Samaritan title for Shechem; but Mr. S. A. Cook with Jerusalem.[4] But Bethulia can hardly be equivalent to Beth-el. Like the place-name Bethul and the personal name Bethuel, it most probably comes from Temul = Ethmael (Ishmael). As for *ya* (*ia*), it probably comes from Yaḥu = Yarḥu = Yeraḥme'el. Temul-Yah was probably the sacred mountain city of the N. Arabian

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Camon,' 'Cyamon,' 'Konæ.'

[2] See *The Veil*, p. 117.

[3] *Journ. of Amer. Or. Soc.* xx. (1899), pp. 160 *ff.*

[4] *E. Bib.*, 'Bethulia.'

borderland.[1] And against Mr. Cook's view one must still regard it as conclusive that from iv. 6 and xv. 5 *f.* it appears that Bethulia and Jerusalem were two distinct places. Mr. Cook thinks that the present phenomena are due to a time when 'the identity of the ideal Bethulia with Jerusalem was forgotten.' But this is pure assumption.

In iv. 6 we find Bethulia side by side with another, at first sight, strange place-name—Betomesthaim. The place lay 'over against Esdraelon (Jezreel) in face of the plain that is near Dothaim.' Bethulia and Dothaim (Dothan)[2] were both in the N. Arabian borderland, and we may assume that Betomesthaim was so too. The first part of the name (Beto) is certainly (like Methu in Methuselah; and cp. Bethulia) from Temul or Ethmul. The other part may easily be a corruption of Miṣrim. Temul-Yarḥu and Temul-Miṣrim closely resemble each other, Miṣrim being a part of Yeraḥme'el. Torrey, however, would identify the place with Samaria, and explains it as Beth-miṣpeh.

The main objection to the prevalent view of *Judith* is that a careful examination of the old Biblical Hebrew narratives elsewhere generally shows that the original background was N. Arabian, and that a subsequent writer has redacted it in accordance with his own views of

1 See *Decline and Fall*, and *The Two Religions*.
2 See *T. and B.* p. 440, and cp. *E. Bib.*, Dothan.

historical propriety. It is natural to assign to this redactor the geographical and historical inaccuracies which now strike the reader. First, as to the names of the two kings and of the general of one of them. Nebuchadnezzar[1] is the name of an Asshurite (*i.e.* North Arabian) king, whose capital was probably called Yewānāh[2] (whence, by corruption, Nineveh). Arphaxad comes from ʿArāb-Kashram; his kingdom was the N. Arabian Madai, and his chief city was Aḥmetha. Olofernes or Orophernes is probably from ʿArāb-Ṣin. Of the other personal names one may mention Achior (described as 'the leader of all the benê Ammon'), which, judging from the analogy of Arioch, should come from Ashḥur, though Dr. Cowley, in Charles, vol. i., passing over analogies, explains it very improbably as 'friend of the Jews' (*aḥihud*). Bagoas is most probably a transformation of Gabi, *i.e.* one belonging to Gab (or Aḳab; cp. on 'Beth-Phage').

[1] From Shanbul-Ḥad-ʿArāb-Ṣōr, or Shanbul-Reḳem-Ṣibʿon.

[2] See my *Two Religions*, pp. 403 *f.*

CHAPTER XI

I MACCABEES

It is not improbable that even the *First Book of Maccabees*, which has so long been regarded as a historical record of the second century B.C., is really based upon a record of a persecution of faithful worshippers of Yahwè by N. Arabian tyrants which took place much earlier than the second century B.C.—perhaps in the sixth century. This fact is, I think, enforced upon us by Dan. iii.; and it is, as I now see, suggested by two passages in 1 Maccabees, viz. i. 54 *f.* and xii. 7. The former passage runs thus:

'And on the fifteenth day of Chislev, in the one hundred and forty-fifth year, they set up upon the altar an abomination of desolation, and in the cities of Judah on every side they established high-places.'

The phrase 'an abomination of desolation' is, of course, suggested by the traditional reading and rendering of Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11, on which Dr. Oesterley (in Charles, i. 70) comments, '*i.e.* the abomination which brought about profana-

tion (= desolation),' which few critics, I suppose, will accept without a qualm. For surely Eberhard Nestle has long since shown[1] that 'Baal of heaven' is at any rate nearer to the author's meaning than the highly unnatural reading presupposed in the Greek text. Now, however, that a step in advance of this has been taken, and that it has been shown that *shamēm* frequently stands for *ishman*[2] (*i.e.* Ishmael), there is no reason for not adopting both in Daniel and in 1 Macc. *shikkuṣ ishman, i.e.* 'idol of Ishmael.' With this we may compare a similar title of the same deity in Dan. xi. 37, where 'the desire of women' should be 'the desire of Ishmannites'; N. Arabian men and women were, surely, equally devoted to the kind goddess Ashtart (cp. Jer. xliv. 15, where, let me venture to suggest in passing, that 'the queen of heaven' should probably be 'the queen of Ishmael').

These passages, I think, are highly suggestive. They confirm the view that an ancient editor has interfered with the text of *First Maccabees*; indeed, when *Jeremiah* and *Daniel* suffered so much, how should this fine narrative book altogether escape?

It thus becomes in a high degree probable that the author of *First Maccabees* had access to, and employed, an earlier writing in which the oppressor

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Abomination of Desolation.'
[2] See *T. and B.* p. 18.

of the Jews referred to was an 'Ishmaelite' or N. Arabian. Of the details of his story we know nothing definite. It is, however, as good as certain that this oppressor aimed at religious as well as political unification for his extended dominions (cp. Judith iii. 8). We shall presently find reason to believe that the Jews expected sympathy and aid in their resistance, surely not from the Spartans, but from the Ṣarephathites.

The name of the great enemy may be hidden underneath Antioch[os], just as another name of the same oppressor may lie hidden underneath Nebuchadnezzar. It indicates that the tyrannical king was an Asshurite, Ashḥur was corrupted into Arioch, and Arioch (if we may be bold) into Antioch[os]. In passing, I may venture to record a much more certain discovery, viz. that the name of the great antagonist of the Græco-Syrian king was properly Akabi[1] (one who belongs to Ashḥur-ʿArāb). Akabi was first shortened into Kabi, and then expanded into Makabi, or, to separate the syllables, Makkabi. Is not this a step further towards the full truth?

[1] See *T. and B.*, *Two Religions* (Index, 'Aḥ'ab').

CHAPTER XII

BOOK OF DANIEL

THE reader has here well-considered supplementary notes to the usual commentaries. My thesis is that, in this as in other books, the original background has been painted out, and a new one, both historical and geographical, substituted.[1]

Dan. i. 2. The land of Shinar is that of Ishman-ʿArāb (Gen. xi. 2, Zech. v. 11).—i. 3. Ashpenaz is abridged from Asshur-Ṣibʿon.—i. 6. Mishael is from Aram-Shā'ul.—i. 7. Belteshazzar, from Ashbal-Azzar; Shadrak, from Shaḥar-Reḳem; Abednego, from ʿArāb-Nebo (in Neh. vii. we hear of Nebo-Ashḥur; Nebo — see p. 33 — is from Shanbul or Shambul); Meshak, from Aram-Ashḥur.—ii. 14. Ariok, from Ashḥur (Gen. xiv. 1).

Dan. iii. is most important for the light thrown on the spread of the deification of kings and on the Book of Judith. Nebuchadnezzar makes a gilded image (of himself)—a symbol of the religious

[1] *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 186.

unity enforced on all his subjects. It is also important to notice that, just as in Isa. lxvi. different conveyances take the place of ethnics (see *Mines of Isaiah*), so, in Dan. iii. 2, the supposed official titles of rulers are really N. Arabian ethnics.[1] One of these ethnics (Ashdādī) passed under the editor's hands into *ahashdarpenim*; another (*pethōrim*) becomes in the same process *tiphtāyē*.

Dan. v. Belshazzar (cp. Belteshazzar) figures here as son of Nebuchadnezzar; the reference is *not* to kings of Babylon. In fact, the greatest N. Arabian kingdom must have been inferior in power to the Babylonian, in spite of the repeated reference to 'all the peoples, nations, and languages,' which only means those included in the N. Arabian empire. The writing on the wall (*vv.* 24 *f.*) has received numerous explanations,[2] but is really a not unparalleled form of soothsaying. What we most readily expect is the name or names of the successful plunderers. And this we seem to get, for the interpretation in *v.* 28, 'given to the Medes and Persians,' is essentially correct. פרס in פרסין must be a regional or ethnic. Can we hesitate as to the meaning? Must not Paraś, here as in Ezra i. 1, Esth. i. 3, Dan. vi. 8, etc., be the name of a distant part of N. Arabia, equivalent to Pathros? The final *-in* may be elided.

[1] *E. Bib.* col. 4459.

[2] See special article in *E. Bib.* cols. 3020 *f.*

This gives us the key to the other parts of the word-group. *Mene* (מנא) must be a corruption of מאן; the first מען is = Yerahme'el, and the second = Ishma"el, unless indeed it should be Madai. *Tekel* (תקל) too is corrupt; we should restore תבל[א]; see *The Veil*, pp. 13 *ff.*, 52, 71. Thus we get the fatal announcement, 'Yeraḥme'el, Madai, Ethbal, and Paraś.'

Dan. vii. 13 *f.* The Celestial Agent of the Enthroned Ancient of Days is called, in vii. 13, 'one like a man' (lit., 'one like a son of man'). As Professor N. Schmidt[1] of Cornell and I[2] have (I think, independently) shown, the Being like a man was the prince-angel Mikael. I must now add (see *T. and B.*, Index) that מיכאל, which occurs also as a personal name, 1 Chr. v. 13, is certainly from יה[ר]כמאל, Yeraḥme'el, the supreme God of the Yeraḥme'elites, but, as the Jews believed, was degraded by their victorious God to the rank of First Prince-Angel. It may be doubted, however, whether he can be distinguished from Ben-Dōd, *i.e.* from the Messiah. Both figures are ideal representatives of Israel, only differing in what we may call their early history. The question, however, arises whether 'one like a man' can have been enough to make it clear who was intended. The kingdom appointed for the Celestial Hero was formed by the combination of Judah and

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Son of Man.'

[2] Cheyne, *Bible Problems* (appended notes).

N. Arabia. Is it not probable that this would be indicated by the description of the Hero? Has there not been some omission?

Dan. viii. 2. Shushan (p. 37). Ulai = Ulami. The real or partly imaginary streams of N. Arabia indicated by their names the land where they flowed. Ulam (1 Chr.) = Yeraḥme'el.—viii. 13, ix. 27, etc.—see p. 112.—viii. 20*f.* The kings are N. Arabian, Madai, Paraś or Pathros, Yawan or Yaman. So at any rate in the original form is x. 4, 'the great river, that is, Ḥiddeḳel,' thus identifying Perāth and Ḥiddeḳel. In fact, Ephrath and Ḥiddeḳel may be the same stream. On the latter, see *T. and B.* pp. 88*f.*, 263, 456 (n. 1).—x. 18, 'one like the appearance of a man' —see p. 116.—x. 21, 'Mika'el your prince'—cp. xii. 1. See *T. and B.* Index. The references under 'Michael' will, I hope, be found profitable. —xi. 6, 'the king of the south' and 'of the north.' In the original form 'the king of Yaman' and 'of Ṣāphōn.'—xi. 37, 'the desire of women.' For *nâshim* rather read *ishmannim*, 'Ishmaelites'—see p. 112.

Dan. xi. 42, 43. The MT. gives as the names of countries Miṣraim, Lubim, and Kushim. In Nahum iii. 9[1] we find the same regionals with the addition of Puṭ, and in 2 Chr. xii. 3 with the addition of Sukkiim. Clearly Miṣraim should be Miṣrim, and Lubim should be Rakbulim

[1] *T. and B.* p. 173.

(= Yeraḥme'elites), while Kushim and Sukkiim[1] are in any case N. Arabian.

Our conclusion must be that both parts of the Book of Daniel depend on earlier writings with N. Arabian background.

[1] Both names may come from Ashḳarim.

CHAPTER XIII

I BARUCH

For a summary of previous criticism I most gladly refer to Dr. Whitehouse in Charles's monumental work. I trust that here too the 'little ship' in which I myself voyage has been guided aright. In i. 4 the exiles are described as 'those that dwelt in Babylon by the river Sud.' 'Babylon,' however, is based on the false reading בבל, which is corrupted from רכבל (Rakbal), and 'Sud' in like manner is a corruption of צור, Ṣor (the southern Ṣor; cp. Ps. lxxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 5). Similarly in *v.* 11 'Baltasar' is said to be the son of 'Nabuchodonosor.' The original text, however, had different names which we can still detect underneath the present, viz. Shanbul-Ḥad-Arâb-Ṣor and Ethbal-Asshur, or some intermediate forms implying N. Arabian origin.

But this is not all that we owe to the newer criticism. In iii. 23 the true text has also been badly corrupted. What have the 'Agarenes' to do here? *They* were not specially wise. Almost certainly בני הגר (Hagarites) should be אגרים,

i.e. אחאבים (Aḥ'abim). 'Ah'ab' is equivalent to 'Canaan'; more strictly it represents 'Ashḥur-Arabia.' The passage (iii. 23) thus ('sons of Hagar') should be בני אגב ('sons of Agab'). Agab (cp. Agabus) is equivalent to Ah'ab, *i.e.* 'Canaan.' Yarbal in l. 2 also implies an obvious correction. The passage thus becomes:

> The sons also of Agab that seek understanding,
> Yarbal, Midian, and Teman.

None of these, says the writer, have found the object of their quest—true wisdom. Of the connexion between wisdom and the N. Arabian peoples I have had to speak in dealing with Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.

PART II

NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The strong romantic atmosphere in the Books of Chronicles has, I fear, blinded the eyes of many to the existence of underlying traditions and lists, partly genealogical, partly geographical, of old personal and local Hebrew names. With regard to the former, it is Prof. Torrey's opinion that the Chronicler 'scattered the names of his like-minded contemporaries (in a rather helter-skelter way, it is true) all through his account of the Restoration, showing that these families were the ones which "returned" with Zerubbabel and Ezra, signed the pledge against foreign marriages and the agreement to support the cultus, built the wall of Jerusalem in the time of Nehemiah, and helped to dedicate it. Here he took the only possible way of placing orthodox Judaism safely beyond the reach of the Samaritans and of the rest of the עם הארץ (which included all the apostates of Israel): *the pure blood and the*

true worship were transmitted only by way of Babylonia.'[1]

It is certainly an ingenious theory that the Chronicler, in framing the lists of Ezra-Neh., used the names of his like-minded contemporaries; but how did he become possessed of the very numerous names in 1 and 2 Chron.? If the lists in 1 and 2 Chron. are, to a large extent, drawn from comparatively old sources, why should those in Ezra-Neh. be either solely or in the main derived from the Chronicler's large acquaintance with strict Yahwists?

It appears to me that the work of the Chronicler has suffered many things at the hands of a redactor, but that we can still detect a predominant reference in the names (alike of Chron. and of Ezra-Neh.) to N. Arabia. This seems to suggest as the object of the Chronicler that of showing that racial and religious purity were with those Jews who had a N. Arabian connexion.

And here I will not withhold what I venture to think a highly reasonable conjecture. This is that, in the time of the first formation of the Gospels, there were still extant lists of persons and places which, whether the framers of those Gospels knew it or not, were connected with that, for the Jews, most important place of sojourn and

[1] *Ezra Studies*, p. 212. The italics are Prof. Torrey's. For 'Babylonia' my own studies would incline me to substitute N. Arabia.

inward development. Much ingenuity has been lavished on the explanation of the various names which I shall quote, but with a very slender amount of cogency. I am therefore well within my rights in attempting fresh methodical explanations, and if some hasty reader should be tempted to call them impossible I may presume to reply that with an expanded horizon he will see more truly and judge more justly. It is only the narrowness of our horizon which bars critical progress, and prevents us from climbing to distant summits. But can we not hear a murmuring sound of falling fences? He who would be in the van of progress will call no reported discovery impossible, but will, rejecting all prejudices, count no trouble too great to put himself at a new point of view.

Prof. W. B. Smith of New Orleans, author of that brilliant work *Ecce Deus*, is not altogether blind to the importance of a new study of Hebrew names, but has not yet adequately considered the effect which the N. Arabian theory may be destined to have on the study of New Testament names, and perhaps too of the central New Testament story. For I cannot conceal my opinion that the study of the Gospel narrative has already passed into a new phase. The first part of the transition was effected when it was shown[1] to be more than

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1911, p. 658; *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 28 *ff.*; also *Bible Problems*, 1909.

probable that the conception of a suffering and yet triumphant divine-human Being was current in the East in very early times. How the Jews can have escaped hearing of it till the second or third century A.D. I (like others) am unable to understand, just as I find it now a hard saying that Israelite eschatology was a pure 'post-exilic' product.[1] Our records unfortunately are but scanty, and I must leave to special scholars in a somewhat narrower department the criticism of the use which has lately been made of a Naassenian (Gnostic) hymn and an adjuration by 'the God of the Hebrews, Jesus.' The second part of the transition will be accomplished by the discovery of fresh literary monuments and by a keener investigation than is perhaps usual of the personal and local names in the story of the Nativity and the Ascension.

To this investigation I will now devote myself. We read in Matt. i. 20 *f.*:

'Behold, an angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary (*i.e.* Mariam) thy wife: for that which is begotten in her is of the Holy Breath. And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesu[s]; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins.'

There are three names in this narrative which lend themselves to the mythic interpretation, viz.

[1] H. Gressmann, *Eschatologie.*

Joseph, son of David, and Mariam. The divine Father and the divine Son may either have the same name, or the relationship between them may be indicated by 'son of.' 'Dōd (friend) was one of the popular names of the chief of the gods, officially more often called Yahwè, Jerahmeel, Ishmael, Hadad, or Rimmon. Either he, or a son of his, sacrificed himself in human form, for the good of man. The religious authorities, however, and those Jews who followed them, altered Dōd into Dāvīd, implying that the God-man of the old popular belief was merely an exalted human king like David, just as they probably altered the name of the goddess Ṣebâ'ith into the innocent word Ṣebā'ōth, "hosts." This took place as early as the shaping of the well-known legend of King David's birth at Bethlehem. There must have been a sanctuary of Dōd at Bethlehem (there was also one at Beersheba), where the initiated took part in the ritual lamentations over Adon (= Adonis) and his sister or spouse,[1] as Jerome (by an anachronistic fiction?) asserts that they did in his day. . . .'[2]

'Now, perhaps we can see how Jesus came to be called son of David and why Bethlehem became his birthplace, more clearly than was possible under the guidance of Prof. Drews. Whether the dying and rising God-man can have been called "son

[1] *Decline and Fall*, pp. 53-55.
[2] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1911, pp. 659 *f.*

of Joseph" as well as "son of Dōd," I may consider later. But if "Joseph" is really a divine name, no thanks are due to [Prof. Drews], whose extravagance here passes all bounds.'[1]

The preceding paragraphs were written in 1911, but the substance of them will be found in *Traditions and Beliefs* (1907), pp. 46 *f.*, 56 *f.*, where, among other things still worthy of a consideration which has been denied them, it is quite correctly mentioned that both Dōd and Ben-Dōd were popular titles of that superhuman Being the Messiah. I hope to have augmented the evidence for my thesis by throwing fresh light on the ritual lamentation for Adōn and Dōdah, and both in articles in the *Hibbert Journal* and in *Mines of Isaiah* I broke fresh ground by discussing the possible reference by name to the self-sacrificing divine-human Friend of Israel. Lastly, in *Bible Problems* I ventured on the field of Daniel and the Apocalypse.

In one of these books I offered the necessary conjecture that the later Jewish belief in a Messiah ben-Joseph, who was to die by the sword of Gog and Magog,[2] is connected with an early popular Messianic belief different from what we find in the canonical writings, and which was itself a development of a still earlier myth of the death and resurrection of a divine Being.

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1911, p. 660.

[2] See Dalman, *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*, 1888.

There is indeed no evidence that the Jewish Messiah was ever called by the name of Joseph. But the title Ben-Joseph given in later times to the suffering Messiah cannot really have been a late theological fiction. Nor is it probable that the Supreme God, regarded as the Father-God, had no special and distinctive name. That name was Joseph; it represents El Elyōn in his character of Father-God, and his divine Son could, consistently with Hebrew thinking, be called so too. But He was, doubtless, more commonly called Ben-Joseph, not specially as the Messiah who suffered, but as He who devoted Himself to death for the sake of Israel. Just so, the Messiah was called both Dōd and Ben-Dōd, and both Yarḥam-Asshur and (presumably) Ben-Yarḥam-Asshur.

We have now to explain the Messianic name Joseph. The ordinary views are hardly any longer acceptable. So then יֹשֵׁב and יָשׁוּב having often to do duty for יִשְׁמָע or יִשְׁמָעֵאל, it is natural to think first of all of יִשְׁבָּל (Yishbal is one of the forms of Ishmael). But though this is not impossible, another view seems more probable. There is a divine name well known to students of the Phœnician and Egyptian inscriptions (it was probably introduced into Egypt from Phœnicia); it is Reshef, apparently a war-god.[1] Most probably this god-name was brought to

[1] See Cooke, *N. Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 56 *ff.*

Canaan, and so to Egypt, from N. Arabia. It is a helpful peculiarity of the Phœn. inscriptions that they always append a qualifying word to Reshef; and this as a rule appears to be a place-name. Thus Reshef-ḥeṣ is equivalent to Reshef-ḥaṣar (see *T. and B.* p. 57), and Reshef-MKL to Yeraḥme'el-Reshef, and (in a pers. name) Reshef-yathan is = Reshef of Ethan; so, too, in a N. Syrian inscription[1] (that of Panammu), though at first Reshef has no added name, but is simply given among the other great gods of Ya'di (close to Rekubel, *i.e.* Yeraḥme'el), we find mention, later on, of Arḳu-Reshef, *i.e.* Ashḥur-Reshef. We cannot hesitate, therefore, to explain Joseph, in Matt. i. 18-25, as a corruption of Yarḥam-Reshef (the omission of R and the difference of the sibilant[2] are unimportant).

Let no one be deterred by the novelty of these results of long and independent study from giving them a thorough consideration *in their context.* It is no doubt strange that so many divine names should consist of regionals, but the fact is supported by abundant evidence. Even Reshef, which appears at first like the name of a god of pestilence (ḥeṣ, 'arrow,' being taken metaphorically), turns out to be no exception to the general rule. For Reshef, agreeably to many analogies, must be a contraction of Raf'ash; just as Par'osh

[1] Cooke, *N. Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 159 *ff.* G. Hoffmann's view is too forced.

[2] Cp. ספרת and צרפת.

(the supposed flea-clan!) must come, by transposition, from the same compound name Raf'ash, *i.e.* Arāb-Asshur.[1] Asshurite Arabia was, in fact, the country from which the cult of the God of the Mysteries reached the Israelites. The other names of that God here given are Dōd and Yarḥam-Asshur.

'Mariam thy wife.' Mariam, too, is a contracted compound divine name. The full form is Arāmath-Yaman. We find this underlying the Massoretic 'Ramathaim' (1 Sam. i. 1) and 'Merathaim' (Jer. l. 21). Again and again an appended *Yām*[2] (*i.e.* Yaman, as in Isa. xxiv. 14) has been mistaken by the early Jewish scholars for the dual ending *aim*. Arāmah is the feminine form of Aram (*Two Religions*, p. 276), better known in the slightly shortened form of Ramah.[3]

In the later N. Arabian temple-archives the fuller forms of the names of the Father-God, the Mother-God, and the Son-God were probably still preserved, but the priestly scholars who watched over these archives will have felt the impact of the tide of religious progress, and have consciously and deliberately obscured the true meaning of those sacred names. More and more Yahwè became possessed of full monarchic rights, and the names Joseph (Yarḥu-Reshef), Mariam (Arāmath-

[1] See the evidence in *T. and B.* p. 178 (on Arpakshad).

[2] See 1 K. xiv. 31, xv. 1.

[3] For the masculine form Ram, see 1 Chr. ii. 9, Num. xxvi. 38 (Aḥiram = Ashḥur-Aram), and 2 K. viii. 16 (= Yarḥu-Aram).

Yaman), and Joshua (Yarḥu-Asshur) became attached, two to a simple man and woman of Galilee, and the third to a gifted prophet and teacher. But in the great Jewish-Christian Apocalypse we still find a wondrous visionary scene in which the woman 'arrayed in the sun,' the child-king of the nations, and the Divine Protector on his throne, are introduced in splendid form, and the dragon their enemy (Rev. xii. 1-9).[1]

First of all, however, let me try to imagine the process of development through which may have passed the originally mythic tradition of the self-sacrifice of the three closely-united deities personified (in the Docetic manner) as a single human being born at Bethlehem. Clearly there must have been at least a bare recital of the facts of the tradition. The supposed birthplace must have been mentioned, viz. a cave at a N. Arabian spot called Bethlehem ('house of Yeraḥme'el'). The divinity of the Person was also impressed on the hearers or readers. But supreme among the facts was surely the love which prompted the unique self-devotion of the triune God, who was born and died and gloriously rose again for man. It must also be assumed that embassies proceeded from the far parts of N. Arabia to the sacred mountain city of Yeho-Asshur (mentioned, it appears, in 2 K. xxiii. 8),[2] where, in the sanctuary

[1] See Cheyne, *Bible Problems* (with appended notes).

[2] *D. and F.* p. 27. The city and the theo-anthropic Victim

precincts, mystic rites were celebrated by the initiated.

The embassies spoken of have found an enigmatical and highly poetical record in Matt. iii. 1, 2:

'Behold, Magi came from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that was born king of the Jews? For we have seen his star at its rising, and are come to do homage to him.'

The earlier form, however, of essentially the same tradition must (unless, to satisfy Prof. Moulton,[1] we reject multitudinous evidences for the N. Arabian theory *en bloc*) in the Hebrew record have had a N. Arabian background. 'Magi,' which baffles contending Iranian scholars, must have been 'Gamrim';[2] 'the east' (*ἀνατολαί*), 'Reḳem,' 'Yeraḥme'el.' The homage about to be proffered by the Gamrim implies that one at least of the Yeraḥme'elite or N. Arabian peoples is prepared to submit to the yoke of Israel and of Yahwè. It has been shown that both Israel and Yeraḥme'el had ambitions. That of Yeraḥme'el (represented by Kōresh) was to unite all the N. Arabian peoples, and Judah as well, under one head; that of Israel was to subject those same Yeraḥme'elite peoples (say, Miṣrim and Asshur)

have the same name (Yarḥu-Asshur), which indicates N. Arabia as the region where the Passion and the Glorification took place, and where the commemorating sanctuary was built.

[1] Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, pp. 428-430.

[2] See *D. and F.* (as above).

to Yahwè and to Israel.[1] It may be doubted whether, as the capital of this neo-Israelite empire, the northern or the southern Jerusalem[2] was intended. Most likely, however, it was the southern and more central city of that venerated name.

The mention of the star will be at once clear when we refer to Num. xxiv. 17*b*:

A star beams out of Jacob,
A sceptre has arisen out of Israel;
He smites through Ephrath of Moab,
And [destroys] all the sons of Ashtar (*gloss*, Ashkar).[3]

The star is the Messiah; but the star gives no friendly light to the sons of Ashtar. To them the star-spirit becomes a heavy, overpowering mace or sceptre (cp. Ps. ii. 9). The framers of our tradition may possibly have thought that the oracles of Balaam would reach the eyes or ears of the Yeraḥme'elites, and that Judas the Maccabee would have appeared to them as the predicted 'mace' or 'sceptre' of the oracles. Would that we could obtain absolute certainty on this point!

At any rate, the temper of these N. Arabians is wholly different from that of the rulers of the

[1] *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 12.
[2] *The Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 26, 34 *f.*, 38, 45, 71.
[3] *Two Religions*, p. 102.

Messiah's own land. The hostility of Herod, who seeks to slay the young child, is but a specimen of that which surrounds all the mythic children for whom a high destiny is marked out. The temple-record must have referred to this, and it may well have mentioned the Ashtarites as the persecutors and the N. Arabian Miṣrites as the people among whom the young child and his mother sought refuge.

So much had to be premised that the reader might get the right point of view for this fruitful but neglected study of New Testament names. I still find it needful to complain of the ignoring of my books by Biblical students, English and German. Cp. *Two Religions*, p. 430. Incidentally I have found occasion (I hope) to throw a bright light on a few of the most interesting of these names, Bethlehem, David, Joseph, Mariam. Let us begin with those which are attached to localities.

CHAPTER II

NAZARETH AND ITS RELATED TRADITIONS. BETHLEHEM

1. *Nazareth.*

That there was no such place-name or regional as Nazaret or Nazareth, or Nazara, in pre-Christian times, is hardly probable,[1] but almost equally hazardous is it to connect Nazoræan or Nazarene (so W. B. Smith) with the Hebrew root NZR, 'to guard,' as if this name meant a worshipper of the deity honoured by the cultus title *noṣer*, 'Guard.' Analogy leads us to expect, not such a vague title as 'Guardian,' but the name of the place or people of the god's worshippers. And the place where the most gracious of Gods was, in pre-Christian times, specially worshipped was (reading underneath the text) in the valley of Gamron[2] (Zech. xii. 11 ; see p. 167), a place which several indications prove to have been in the N. Arabian borderland, and, as we may plausibly conjecture, in the southern Galilee.

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Nazareth'; W. B. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Jesus.*

[2] See *T. and B.* pp. 56, 326, 438 *f.* ; *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 29.

I will first of all justify this heresy of my own by recording the 'desperate conjecture' of an eminent living critic. It is well known that some of the ancients connected 'Nazarene' with נזיר, 'a Nazirite,' lit. 'one consecrated,' and Prof. Burkitt[1] hazards the conjecture that Ναζαρεθ is 'really connected with נזיר and the vow of the Nazirites.' He admits, however, that 'it is a desperate conjecture,' and that 'he would not make it, were it not that the ordinary view of Nazareth seems to him wholly unproved and unsatisfactory.' Now the difficulty of the implied interchange of צ and ז is greatly exaggerated by Prof. Burkitt, and I would not criticize him on this account. There are, as a fact, many instances of such an interchange in the popular speech of Palestine.

I venture, therefore, to propound a new theory, or rather, if I may speak freely, a discovery, which has relieved my own mind from an intolerable burden. It arose in my thoughts quite naturally through the perception that the original names of places or regions may often be detected underneath the later names. Of course, we must assume the common figure of metathesis as well as the corruptions and interchanges of letters characteristic of popular speech. Indeed, if a word seems obstinately closed to investigation, our first step should be to try the effect of metathesis, not arbitrarily, but in accordance with some proved or

[1] Burkitt, *Syriac Forms of N.T. Proper Names*, p. 18.

probable theory of the history of the period. In the present case we shall do well to accept a suggestion from the theory which alone solves the difficulty of many parallel problems, viz., that some name which underlies the plainly corrupt form Nazareth is an old synonym for Gālīl, *i.e.* the southern Galilee. (That there was a southern Galilee, I have not had to learn from Resch.[1] There was such a district situated not very far from the religious capital of the N. Arabian borderland. The parallelism is curiously exact.)

What, then, is the old synonym for Gālīl underlying Naṣr, Nazar, or Nazōr? (We will consider the feminine ending of Nazareth presently.) It is Reṣin or Rezon; both forms are attested—only as personal names, it is true, but we know that many personal names began by being regionals. From this came the popular modification Nazareth, as if 'region of נצרים,' *i.e.* shooting plants. Reṣin itself is not the original form; it comes (like Birsha from ʿArāb-Asshur, Bedad from ʿArāb-Dad, Beṣalel from ʿArāb-Ishmael) from Bar-Ṣin. And what does Bar-Ṣin mean? *Bar*, as in all proper names into which this enters, is modified from Rab, which in all compound proper names comes from ʿArāb[2] (Arabia). Ṣin too is a shortened form. It comes

[1] See *E. Bib.*, 'Matthias.'

[2] *D. and F.* p. 57 (n. 1); *T. and B.* p. 109 (n. 2); *Veil*, p. 86 (n. 3).

from Ṣib'on (= Ishmael); an intermediate form is Ṣoan. Thus we get, for Bar-Ṣin, 'Arāb-Ṣib'on.

The name has developed in another very interesting way, if I am right in regarding Chorazin[1] (Matt. xi. 21, Luke x. 13) as a corruption of Bar-Ṣin.[2] It is easier, however, to take Chorazin as being for Achor-Ṣin,[3] *i.e.* the Galilæan part of the region called Achor. We have an exact parallel for this in the place-name Chor-Ashan.

But we have still to account for the ending *et* in Nazaret. In spite of the Greek vowel ε, the Hebrew ending of Bar-Ṣin may have been *ath.* Rab-Ṣinath may have been a title of the goddess Ashtart, who was originally a member of the divine company of three.[4] It is by no means uncommon in these old Jewish writings for the name of a deity to be supplanted by a title, and, as a rule, this title indicates the region from which the Israelites derived this divinity's cult. Such titles are often only known to us in a mutilated form —take, for instance, *Zonah* in Dt. xxiii. 18 and Jer. v. 7, which is surely a corruption of *Ṣib'onah*, *i.e.* Ashtart. Similarly Reṣinath (Bar-Ṣinath) is most probably a mutilated title of the same great goddess. When the inclusion of a goddess in the inner council of deity had become repugnant to the most religious Israelites, the title of the goddess

1 For the Greek readings see *E. Bib.*, 'Chorazin.'

2 *Hibbert Journal*, July 1913, p. 918.

3 *Ibid.*, July 1911, p. 892. 4 See *Two Religions*, Index.

had to give way to the imaginary city-name,[1] Nazareth. But the original form of the gracious deity's name was Yarḥu-Asshur-Rabṣinath.[2]

2. *Bethlehem.*

There is no reason why the incarnate God should not have been born at Beth-Lehem. But which Beth-Lehem? For it is probable that there were three places which bore the name Beth-Lehem; nor can we wonder at this, considering that Beth-Lehem is merely a record that here in olden times was a settlement of N. Arabians; in short, *Lehem* is not a loaned Babylonian god-name, but a witty popular modification of *Yeraḥme'el*.[3] One of these three was reckoned to the tribal territory of Zebulun (Josh. xix. 15), another to that of Judah (1 S. xvii. 12), and a third appears to have belonged to the Israelite N. Arabian borderland. The second, according to our authorities in their present form, was the birthplace of David, and, presumably, so soon as the Messiah belief (originally popular) received official sanction, the Judaite Beth-Lehem began to expel the N. Arabian as the supposed birthplace both of David and of 'great David's greater son.' The framers or expanders of traditions, however, were slow to abolish all the

[1] The case is similar to that of Yahwè Ṣeba'oth. See *T. and B.*, Index.

[2] *Hibbert Journal*, July 1913, p. 919. The name became corrupted into Yeshua-Nazaret. [3] *T. and B.* pp. 51, 419 *f.*

traces of N. Arabian influence on the Israelite race, culture, and religion, and in 1 Chron. ii. 50*f.* *Salma abî Beth-Lehem* is reckoned to the family of *Ḥur*, *i.e.* Ashḥur, who is N. Arabian.[1] We may also note that in Gen. xxxiii. several glosses indicate that Beth-Lehem was situated in N. Arabia.[2]

Now if, on the one hand, there was a chronicle of the temple-history, and of the matters which were interesting to temple-worshippers, what event would so surely stand at the very head of the chronicle as the incarnation of the gracious divinity to whom doubtless the sanctuary of Yarḥam-Asshur[3] was dedicated? And where can the incarnation more easily be imagined than in a cave? I cannot, however, bring myself to follow Winckler,[4] who holds that the chest (*'arōn*) of 2 S. vi. 3 contained the newly born Tammuz-Yahwè. The identification of Yahwè-Yeraḥme'el with Tammuz is very probable.[5] But how shall we say that in David's time Yahwè was only '*lately* born'? In the mysteries, at any rate, the birth of Yahwè-Yeraḥme'el must have been primeval. There is no period in which it could not have been said, 'In all their affliction He was afflicted.'

[1] On the genealogy, cp. Gemoll, *Grundsteine*, pp. 156 *f.* אבי in such verbal collocations is, in my opinion, the short for עֲרָב = אבר.

[2] *T. and B.*

[3] See *D. and F.* p. 27.

[4] *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 95.

[5] See *E.B.*, 'Tammuz.'

CHAPTER III

MORE PLACE-NAMES—GETHSEMANE, GOLGOTHA, BETHANY, ETC.

An archaizing and not always intelligent tendency is unmistakable in the later Old Testament writers; a failure to observe this has marred much 'higher criticism.' It seems to me that there is a trace of this tendency in *the Circle* (*kikar*) *of Jordan*, in the account of the ministry of John the Baptist (see Matt. iii. 5, Luke iii. 3). For the first and the third evangelists would hardly have used the expression ἡ περίχωρος unless they had had before them a Hebrew tradition in which reference was made to 'the *kikkar*' (*i.e.* the Eshkar or Ashkar) of Jordan. Now the expression 'the circuit, or circle, of Jordan' really implies an entirely wrong view. It ought to designate a portion of the N. Arabian borderland,[1] but it came to be understood of a part of the *Ghor*, *i.e.* of the Jordan-valley. The framer of the tradition misunderstood.

[1] *The Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 16, 134 *ff.*; *Two Religions*, p. 166 (n. 3).

Another solution of the problem is offered by Martin Gemoll (*Grundsteine*, p. 252), but I will not digress by discussing it.

We have other examples of the archaizing use of 'the *kikkar*' in Neh. iii. 22, xii. 28; the use of Gethsemane, Gabbatha, and Golgotha is partly parallel.

Other Place-names

1. *Beth-Phage.*

The usual theory connecting this name with unripe figs is almost as unsuitable as the prevailing theory of the Mount of Olives. As in Bagoas and Bigwai, there seems to be a reference to N. Arabia, from which land the Israelites and Canaanites came. Probably Beth-Phage comes from Beth-Gabbim (see 'Gabbatha'). Or may we not restore, as the original form, Beth-Gabbith? See 'Bethany.'

2. *Gethsemane.*

The name, I well know, is one that opens the fountain of religious emotion. There are, however, some objections, not devoid of probability, to the acceptance of this name as accurate. On the analogy of the 'threshing-floor of Araunah (?) the Yebusite,' we should expect the second part of the name now read Gethsemane to be the personal name of the ancient proprietor. As it stands, however, the name is hardly acceptable.

Gath, of course, should mean 'a wine-press,' and *shemen* means 'oil.' But does *gath* always mean 'wine-press'? As a city-name this seems not at all a suitable sense, and I have therefore proposed the theory that the city-name Gath may (rather, must) be a shortened form of Golath or the like (cp. Goliath, Gullath), which in turn may (must) originate in 'Gilead.' I have also suspected, and the suspicion has been amply justified, that Shemen is not always 'oil,' but sometimes the short for Ishman (= Ishmael).

It is my opinion, agreeably to what I have written on Nazareth and Bethlehem, that in the archives of the Israelite temple in the N. Arabian borderland was a record of the wonderful experiences of the incarnate Saviour-God, and that this record contained various names of places and persons which would harmonize with the N. Arabian theory. Three such place-names, which occurred in the original story of the Passion in irrecoverable contexts, are Gethsemane, Golgotha, and Gabbatha. The first of these has now been explained; it means Gilead of the N. Arabians, the region in which the southern Jerusalem stood. The others will be treated next.

3. *Golgotha.*

Golgotha, the scene of the Crucifixion, means apparently 'skull.' Efforts have been made to

take off from the strangeness of this, but there is still some appearance of force: for myself, I venture to think that underneath *gulgoleth* there lurks *golath*, and under *golath* lurks *gil'ad*. Gilead, as we have seen, probably comprehended the southern Jerusalem.

4. *Gabbatha.*

This name, at any rate, has not been plausibly explained. It reveals its secret, however, to those who have shaken off prejudices. Gab, Gob, and Agab (in 'Agabus,' the name of a New Testament prophet; cp. also Bagoas in the Book of Judith) are corrupt forms of Aḥ'ab,[1] which comes ultimately from Ashḥur-'Arāb, one of the current names of the N. Arabian borderland. I suppose that 'John' found this name in an ill-understood context, and was unwilling to forego the evidence of topographical accuracy which it seemed to afford. I am glad to notice that Professor W. B. Smith speaks very emphatically of the 'futility' of the search for Golgotha and Gabbatha. Thus far indeed it has been 'vanity of vanities,'[2] but may not this be because we have not gone the right way to work?

5. *Bethany.*

Was it really a village (John xi. 1)? Or

[1] *T. and B., Two Religions, Mines of Isaiah, The Veil of Hebrew History*; in each case see Index.

[2] Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Gabbatha,' 'Golgotha.'

was it a part of the great northern suburb of Jerusalem?[1] It is at any rate referred to by name in connexion with Bethphage (Mark xi. 1), which appears to have been part of that suburb. Are Bethphage and Bethany the same place? They must at any rate have been close together, and the expression in Mark xi. 1 looks as if the redactor were not quite sure of his ground. To prove this, or at least to make it a very reasonable conjecture, we must be able to show that the two place-names are equivalent. And they are, if Beth-Phage is from Beth-Gabbith, and Βηθανια from Beth-Ṣo'aniyyah. There is abundant evidence that the worship of Ashtart was very prevalent even after Josiah's so-called Reformation, and that the worshippers of this great goddess under the title of Ṣib'onah (= Ṣib'onith) resorted to a temple sacred to her we may gather from the true text of Jer. v. 7. Here the Judaites are accused of cutting their flesh (ritually) in the house of the *ṣōanah* (this is altered, from a religious scruple, into *zōnāh*, 'harlot'; *ṣōanah* is a shortened form of *Ṣib'onah*).[2] The same scruple, which shows itself in the alteration in Jer. v. 7, may be accountable for the reading 'Bethania,' *i.e.* בית צעניה[3] became בית-אניה.

The result is that there were two names for the sanctuary of Ashtart in the great suburb of

[1] E. A. Abbott, *E. Bib.*, 'Lazarus,' col. 2747.

[2] *Two Religions*, p. 51 (n. 3).

[3] צבעניה = צעניה.

Jerusalem; the one was 'house of the Aḥ'abbite (= Gabbite),' the other 'house of the Ṣib'onite.' In Gospel times, however, the temple was no more and the place-name was corrupt.

6. *Bezetha.*

From what will presently be said on the 'Mountain in Galilee' my readers can have no difficulty in understanding my view of Bezetha. As Dr. Abbott says, 'It seems clear from [Josephus] that Bezetha, or Bezethma, was the Jewish name for Kainopolis or "New-town," and that the two names did not denote different places.'[1] Josephus, however, does not apparently understand what he probably learned at his mother's knee. For in reality the name Kainopolis is based on a pretty frequent mistake of ancient scholars; *i.e.* Ir Ḥadashah, 'New-town,' should be 'Arāb-Ashḥurah, 'Ashḥurite Arabia.'[2] This is only another form of the name underlying the more ordinary form Bezetha, which is 'Arāb-Ashtar.[3] That Ashtar and Ashḥur are equivalent, has been shown again and again, and can hardly be disputed, unless indeed the whole fabric of the N. Arabian theory can be subverted. 'Arāb-Ashtar may well be a name of the N. Arabian quarter

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Lazarus,' col. 2747.

[2] *Ibid.*, 'Hadashah,' 'Kir-Hareseth.'

[3] For the omission of א in אב (= ערב) cp. the personal names Birsha, Baasha (*T. and B.* p. 237).

of Jerusalem, another ancient name of which may be traced in Zeph. i. 10.[1]

7. *The Mountain in Galilee.*

In Mark xvi. 7 it is said by the angel, 'Go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you.' And in Matt. xxviii. 16, 'But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them.' Luke, however, places the scene of the Ascension near Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 50), 'He led them out until they were over against Bethany,' and again (Acts i. 12), 'Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet.' Lastly, the apocryphal work called the *Acta Pilati* affirms with much insistence that the greatest of the appearances was on Mount Mamilch.[2]

Now we may reasonably suppose that the chronicle of events interesting to those who were initiated into the mysteries of Yarḥam-Asshur, recorded not only the incarnation of the gracious deity, but also his death, resurrection, and ascension. It is, I believe, not impossible to find by a keen criticism traces of the original record. Thoroughly

[1] *Two Religions* (if the northern Jerusalem is meant), p. 409; *Decline and Fall*, p. 19.

[2] Badham and Conybeare (*H.J.*, July 1913) take Mt. Mamilch to be between Samaria and Galilee, and refer to Judg. v. 14 and xii. 15, where, however, the true background is N. Arabian. See *Crit. Bib.*, 'Judges.'

non-historical as many of the records in the temple chronicle must have been, we can, by the use of right methods, extract some grains of historical truth. This is what I am endeavouring in these chapters to do. The difficulties may be great, but every grain of truth, even as to beliefs which, as wholes, have long since faded away, is a satisfaction to the searching impulse of the human mind.

The synoptic evangelists, as we have seen, are not in agreement, and 'John' does not lose a word on the story, though, in his spiritualistic way, he alludes several times to it. I venture myself to suppose that the ascension or assumption, as well as the death and resurrection, of the compassionate Saviour-God, was recorded in the temple-archives. I am also very clear that the Jerusalem of the temple-record must have been in or near the southern Galilee. Between this Galilee (*gālīl*) and Gilead (*gil'ad*) there cannot have been a great distance. Now, there is, as I have sought to show, one mountain which had special claims to be mentioned in mythic narratives—Mount Ashtor or Ashḥur (the two names are equivalent). The former is the name of the mountain or mountain-range on which the ark was said to have rested;[1] with a prefixed Yaman it is the designation of the mountain from which Yahwè came to Israel.[2] The latter, with

[1] *T. and B.* p. 70. The traditional text corruptly gives Araraṭ.

[2] *D. and F.* pp. 166*f.*

the addition of Yeraḥme'el, is the name of the mountain on which legend originally placed the attempted sacrifice of Isaac.[1] It is, moreover, the latter with which we must identify Mount Mamilch, *i.e.* Mount Yeraḥme'el.

It appears that near Mt. Ashtar there was a city of nearly the same name which shared the sanctity of the mountain; and it may perhaps have been Og's royal city Ashtereth, or, if I may venture on such a heretical opinion, it may have been the southern Jerusalem or Urushalem (= Asshur-Ishmael). Elsewhere I have remarked —in connexion with this subject—that 'the original narrator of Gen. xxii. very probably identified this sacred mountain with that on which was the threshing-floor of Araunah (Adoniyyah) the Yebusite, and referred also to 2 Chron. iii. 1.'[2] It may now be added that the supposed reference to the 'Mount of Olives' in 2 S. xv. 30 was not always attached to the familiar hill near el-Kuds. Even after the text-reading has been corrected we must still affirm that 'the ascent of the Ashtarites' did not originally belong to the familiar hill. That is all that I need say here. The 'Mount of Olives' should be 'the Mountain of the Ashtarites,' and the mountain referred to was in N. Arabia.

[1] *D. and F.* p. 143. See *T. and B.* p. 328.

[2] *Veil of Hebrew History*, p. 45.

CHAPTER IV

N.T. LISTS OF COUNTRIES OF THE DISPERSION (Acts ii. 5-13; 1 Pet. i. 1)

THE sound as of a mighty wind brought a band of inquirers together, representing, as the redactor tells us, 'every nation (country) under heaven' (*v.* 5). Underneath the list of countries in *vv.* 9-11, however, it is easy to read a much more modest summary, apparently designed for the special use of those Judæans who had an abiding interest in the N. Arabian Dispersion. The most suspicious of the pairs or triads are: the first, beginning with 'Parthians'; the third—'Judæa and Cappadocia'; and the last—'Cretans and Arabians.' There is an ancient correction (D) of 'Judæa,' viz. 'India,' but this too is plainly unsuitable. The list should probably run nearly thus:[1]

Pathros and Madai and Elam,
And those that dwell in Aram-naharaīm,
In Hadad and Caphtor,

[1] On the names see *Traditions and Beliefs* and *Two Religions* (Indices); also *E. Bib.*, 'India.'

In Puṭ and Asshur,
In Arpachshad and Pul,
In Miṣrim and the parts of Lubim about Ḳir,
[And sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes,]
Kerethites and Arabians.

Parallels in the Old Testament are by no means wanting; see *e.g.* Isa. xi. 11 and lxvi. 19 (where the return of the exiles is limited to the N. Arabian countries). The sermon of Peter does not, it is true, develop the idea of the expansion of the Jewish race, but this exhortation was, of course, not derived from the same source as the list of countries.

May we infer from the latter record that the missionary interest of the first disciples was at this early period specially attracted by the Jews of N. Arabia? It would not be at all an extravagant conjecture. Early in the second century A.D. a writer, who has assumed the mantle of Simon Peter, addressed his exhortations (nominally at least) to the Jews of various N. Arabian districts, and in the opening lines gives proof of his acquaintance with the list of countries in Acts ii. The passage runs as follows when the original text has been restored:

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Puṭ, Gilead, Caphtor, Asshur, and Ethban.[1]

[1] See *T. and B.* Index.

Doubtless it is a pure romance that Peter had any personal connexion with Jewish-Christian communities in N. Arabia, and sent round a letter of general exhortations to the other Christian bodies, himself sojourning the while in the ancient city of Bābel.[1] But so, too, it was a pure fiction, that assembly of representatives of all the N. Arabian Jewish communities and that sermon of Peter's to the multitude.

I will only quote one more passage (1 Pet. v. 13), 'She that is in Bābel, elect together with you, saluteth you.' Here the Greek gives Βαβύλωνι, but when we have once seen underneath the opening verse we cannot doubt that Βαβύλωνι means, not our familiar Babylon on the Euphrates, but the capital of one of the principal N. Arabian kingdoms. There is, of course, no evidence that Peter evangelized N. Arabia, but there may be a grain of truth in Acts ii. 9-11, 1 Pet. i. 1, v. 13, viz. that the first disciples sent representatives to carry the Glad Tidings to that region.

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 187 *f.*; *Two Religions*, pp. 59, 361-363.

CHAPTER V

NAMES OF APOSTLES AND OTHERS (BARABBAS, BARNABAS, ETC.)

THE names of the Apostles gain in interest when we see that, as belonging to a body of twelve spiritual leaders, they are mostly of very doubtful historicity. For when we see this, a new and exciting task devolves upon us—that of explaining how and why the authors of the Synoptic Gospels fixed upon precisely *these*. The answer to the first question is that these writers, like the Chronicler, had access to and employed lists of names. These names presumably were those of Jewish Christians, and the remarkable thing is that they are apparently all planned on the same model, all, in their original forms, being derived from S. Canaanitish or N. Arabian place-names or clan-names. And to the second question we answer that these place-names or clan-names stamped their bearers as genuine and (if the word may be applied) orthodox Jews.

The lists of Apostles' names in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts of the Apostles are in Mark iii.

16-19, Matt. x. 2-4, Luke vi. 14-16, and Acts i. 13. In spite of the authority assigned by critics to Mark, it is difficult to believe that the distribution into pairs given by Matthew and Luke is (except perhaps for the first two) original.

(1) Let us begin with '*Simon* who is called *Peter* [Petros] and *Andrew* his brother.' Evidently Simon (Symeon in Acts) is Shimon (1 Chron. iv. 20), which consists of *Shim*, *i.e.* Shema (= Ishmael), and *on*, a formative appendix. Peter or Petros is certainly either from Pathrosi, 'one belonging to Pathros,'[1] or from Perathi = Ephrathi.[2] At an early date, however, Petros was explained from the Greek as Rockman, etc., and a new Aramaic surname was coined as a substitute, viz. *Kēphā*, 'rock' (cp. Matt. xvi. 18, John i. 49). *Bar-Yona* is also found as a surname. We might explain this either 'son of a dove' and find here a trace of primitive totemism,[3] or 'son of Yonathan.'[4] Neither view, however, gives a good sense; and we have also to consider *bar*. Now, it has been shown elsewhere that in compound names like this, initial *bar* or *rab* invariably comes from *'arāb* (Arabia).[5] It has also been shown to

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 155, 189; *Two Religions*, pp. 88 *f.*, 302.

[2] See *Two Religions*, pp. 102, 119, 180, and note that one of the Bethlehems was in Ephrathah.

[3] See *E. Bib.*, 'Jonah.'

[4] *E. Bib.*, 'Johanan.'

[5] *Two Religions*, pp. 403 *f.*, 412.

be almost certain that the capital of the N. Arabian Asshur was a city called, not Nineveh, but Yewānah.[1] So then we cannot well hesitate to explain Bar-Yona as 'ʿArāb-Yewānah,' *i.e.* that part of Arabia which comprehended Yewānah, and to take Simon Petros Bar-Yona as an emphatic statement that the person so called gloried in his descent from Israelite exiles in Yewānah.

(2) 'And *Andrew* his brother.' The same key will also unlock this fresh riddle. Ἀνδρέας is not 'manly' (*E. Bib.*), as if of Greek origin; the δ is euphonic, as in Ἔσδρας. We have then to account for Anreas. The final *as* is probably the well-known Greek ending, while *anr* is the Old Testament ענר (Gen. xiv. 13, 24) and נער in the personal names Naarah and Neariah and in Gen. xxxvii. 2, where 'and he was a lad' (R.V.) should be, 'that is, Shinar.'[2] Shinar is, in fact, one of the names for N. Arabia; it comes undoubtedly from 'Ishman-ʿArāb,' *i.e.* Ishmael of Arabia. Again a proof of the value attached by the compilers of such lists to descent from the exiles.

(3) and (4) '*James* (the son) of Zebedee and *John* his brother.' *Zabdai* comes from root ZBD, on which I may refer to *E. Bib.*, 'Zebedee,' and *T. and B.* As Mark iii. 17 tells us, James (Jacob) and John were surnamed *Boanerges*. This is no

[1] *Two Religions*, pp. 403 *f.*, 412.

[2] *T. and B.* pp. 435 *f.* ש omitted, as in אחר for אשחר.

doubt = בני אשכר, 'sons of Ashkar.'[1] *Jacob* (Ya'aḳob) has been, till now, quite obscure; the N. Arabian theory has lately thrown a bright light upon it.[2] The nucleus is Aḳab (which is found in one of the Elephantiné papyri, and is found as a god-name in 2 Isaiah). We can also point both to contracted and to expanded forms of Aḳab, viz. Gob, and of course Ya'aḳob. We must notice further that Aḳab comes from Ah'ab, a form equivalent to Ashhur-'Arāb, *i.e.* Ashḥur of Arabia.

Johanan may plausibly be explained 'Yahwè is a pitying one.' But when we look at the list of occurrences of Ḥanan in *E. Bib.*, we feel that there may be some meaning more N. Arabian in its implications than that commonly given, even though the ordinary explanation has the support of Nöldeke.[3] For instance, the title benê Ḥanan appears as that of a family of the Nethinim (= Ethanim) in the great post-exilic list of families in Ezra-Neh. It is also noteworthy that Hanan ben Maakah is the name of one of David's warriors (1 Chron. xi. 43), and that Ben-Ḥanan (from Bar-Ḥanan) appears as a personal name[4] in 1 Chron. iv. 20. It is not impossible that Ḥanan and Ḥanok are cognate. The Ḥanokites, too, were an important branch of the N. Arabian

1 On Ashkar (=Asshur-Reḳem) see *T. and B.* and *Two Religions*. 'Sons of thunder' = בני רעם (really 'sons of Yarḥam').

2 *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 114, 131 *f.*

3 *The Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 147 *f.*

4 See *E. Bib.*, 'Names,' § 50.

race.[1] As for the initial *Jo* (*Yo*) in Johanan, it has doubtless come from Jarḥu (Yarḥu = Yeraḥme'el).

(5) and (6) '*Philip* and *Bartholomew*.' Again a Greek name, which might be explained by the spread of Hellenic influences in the northern Galilee. A Greek name, however, would be unparalleled in this list, and we should do well to apply our key. Is not the original of Philip ''Abiba'al,' *i.e.* 'Arāb-Yeraḥme'el?

Bartholomew also requires a new explanation. We require a true personal name. The first element in the true name is, of course, 'Arāb; the second is Temuli or (MT. of 2 S. iii. 3) Talmai (Βολμει). The original of the latter is *ethmūl*, which is, more often than not, a distortion of Ishmael.[2] 'Arāb-Ishmael, 'Ishmaelite Arabia,' tells us that the family to which Bartholomew, if he existed, belonged, belonged to the 'people of the land.' 'In Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 1, § 5) the name Tholomaios occurs as borne by a robber-chief' (*E. Bib.* col. 489).

[1] Parallels for Ben-Ḥanan = Bar-Ḥanan are Ben-Ḥail = Bar-Yeraḥme'el (2 Chron. xvii. 7); Ben-Ḥesed = Bar-Ashḥur (1 K. iv. 10); Ben-Hadad = Bar-Hadad. In all these names Bar is equivalent to 'Arāb. The alteration of Bar into בן may have been very early. At any rate it was very early in the case of Bar-Ṣedek underlying Ben-Ṣedek in *Amarna Tablets*, 125, 37 (Ṣedek is a regional; see *The Veil, etc.*, pp. 42 *f.*); early, too, in the case of Binyamin for Bar-Yamīn, *i.e.* Arabia of Yamīn (Yaman). 'Arāb (Arabia) also becomes Rab, as *e.g.* in Rab-Mag (see p. 20), Rab-Shakeh (*i.e.* 'Arāb-Ashḥur).

[2] *Two Religions*, p. 258.

(7) and (8) '*Thomas*, and *Matthew* the publican.' 'Thomas, who is called Didymos' (John xi. 16); תְּאוֹם being the Hebrew for 'twin.' But analogy is against this view, and the occurrence of טמא (unclean) in Isa. lii. 1, in place of אתמן, Ethman[1] (= Ishmael), suggests that the same alteration may be necessary here. Nestle questions whether the name occurs before the MT., but the proper name תאם in *CIS*, i. No. 46 (Cook, p. 62) should probably be similarly explained. Matthew 'the publican' is generally identified with Levi, and certainly the circumstances of the call of Levi agree remarkably with those of the call of Matthew. Why the fusion of the two figures was made, we do not know. A Levite is not likely to have sought for the despised calling of a tax-collector, nor is Levi a probable proper name.[2] As to the form Μαθθαῖος or Ματθαῖος, it is probably from 'Mattānāthai,' which is from Ethman (= Ethan). See *Matthias*.

(9) and (10) '*James* (son) of Alphæus, and *Thaddæus*.' Alphæus (the name of the father of James) has often, and (as I think) rightly, been connected with Lebbæus. The original both of Alphai and of Lebbai is probably Arbelai. Beth-Arbel, *i.e.* Beth-Yeraḥme'el, was a place in the N. Arabian borderland with which Hosea (x. 14) associates a terrible massacre.[3]

[1] *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 158.

[2] Or is 'Levi' simply a primitive corruption of 'Lebbai'?

[3] *Two Religions*, pp. 215, 272.

Thaddæus, according to the Textus Receptus of Matt. x. 3, was the surname of Lebbæus. It is, however, according to Westcott-Hort, insufficiently supported. 'Lebbæus' has been explained already. 'Thaddæus' is probably from 'Shetharai.' Shethar is a shortened form of Ashtar (p. 15), which is one of the current names of the N. Arabian borderland.

(11) and (12) '*Simon the Cananæan* and *Judas Iscariot*.' 'Cananæan' is a Græcized form of קָנְאָנִי, 'a man of Canaan.'[1]

Judas Iscariot, 'who also was to deliver him up.' A store of possible explanations both of Judah and of Iscariot will be found in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. The fault of the latter, if I may say so, is the tacit assumption that Iscariotes specially refers to an individual, whereas it could as well be applied to any other member of a N. Arabian Jewish family as to 'him who was to surrender him.' There is a fem. form of Ashḥur (a well-known word for N. Arabia) which with the gentilic affix becomes Ashḥart'ai.[2] This word we may do well to take as the original both of Ἰσκαριώτης and of a little group of place-names including Kerith, Ḳiryah, Kerioth. On Judah see *T. and B.* p. 376; *The Veil*, p. 154.

(13) *Matthias*. From Ethman-Yarḥu. Cp. *Matthew*.

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Simon,' 6.

[2] Cp. *The Veil of Hebrew History*, pp. 18, 47, 52, 56.

Other Personal Names

Zacchæus.

Ultimately from *Ṣidḳai* (Ṣedeḳ is the name of a district in the N. Arabian borderland). The intermediate form is Zidḳai. צ and ז, כ and ק, are interchanged in popular speech.

Simon the Leper (Mark xiv. 31).

'While he was in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper.' Dr. Abbott has good reason to question the accuracy of 'the leper,' and adds in a footnote, 'Jeroboam's mother is certainly called "Zeruah" (1 K. xi. 26), but this is either a deliberate insult or a corruption.'[1] There can be no doubt that the facts quoted elsewhere justify the view that the surname of the entertainer of the Saviour was 'the Miṣrite,' *i.e.* that he was known to be a sojourning Jew from N. Arabia;[2] see Acts ii. 10, and p. 152. Read, therefore, in the underlying Hebrew of the name, not מצרע, but מצרי.

Barabbas.

Whether the last redactor of the complex narrative of the Passion had in his mind a

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Lazarus,' col. 2747; and see *The Veil of Hebrew History*, p. 87; *E. Bib.*, 'Zeruah.'

[2] On this region see *T. and B.* pp. 171, 173; *D. and F.*, Intr. pp. xii, xiii *ff.*, 37, etc.

notable bandit named Bar-abba[s], we cannot tell. And what is the ultimate explanation of the circumstances in which he plays so singular a rôle, we are equally ignorant. Meantime I am content with the light from Babylon. There are traces of a primitive custom of decking out some person of inferior rank as king, and finally putting him to death in place of the real king. On the occasion of what ceremony this took place, does not appear, and it seems plain that the author of the Barabbas story only knew of 'a far-off reflection of the primitive custom in the shape of a popular story.'[1] As for the name בַּר אַבָּא, it is obviously corrupt, but the true reading is as easy to interpret as we can wish.

In Bar-abba[s] the only element which has been thought suspicious is the second. 'Son of the father' is not very natural, even if 'father' be explained as meaning 'rabbi.' Hence various explanations involving the minimum of alteration have been proposed.[2] But these, too, fail in naturalness, and it becomes needful to refer to well-tested parallels to discover the 'inwardness' of the name. The only corruption is in the innocent-looking *bar*. We want a personal name, but personal names do not begin with *bar* 'son (of).' Generally *bar* comes from *'arāb*. But this will not do here, because *ab* is also =

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, April 1911, p. 661.

[2] See *E. Bib.*, 'Barabbas.'

ʿarāb.[1] We must therefore read, for *bar*, *kar*, and those who have studied my previous volumes with assent will at once see that *kar-ab(ba)* represents *Yarkam-ʿArāb*, *i.e.* Arabian Yeraḥme'el. No form of name is more common than this.

The bandits who sought to subvert the fabric of Roman civilisation in S. Palestine were therefore, to a large extent, N. Arabians.

Bartimæus (Mark x. 46-52).

Here, as elsewhere in the *E. Bib.*, Prof. P. W. Schmiedel is almost exhaustive in his collection of facts and theories, but his own result is curiously out of proportion to his philological learning and dialectic ability. Since this able scholar wrote, Wellhausen has held the possibility of a Greek origin, comparing Tolmai for Ptolemaios. But, as we have seen, Bar-Tolmai comes from ʿArāb-Temuli; Bartimæus, therefore, will probably come from ʿArāb-Ethāmi (ערב־איתמי). Probably all that the framer of the story knew was that Bar-timai occurred in a list of families which were believed to have returned from N. Arabia. The symbolic character[2] of the blind beggar remains undisturbed.

[1] אב or אבי represents ערב, both at the beginning and even (as in Ḥuram'abi) at the end of personal names.

[2] See W. B. Smith, *Ecce Deus*, pp. 322-4. I venture to hold that Bartimæus is a symbol of the N. Arabian Jews and proselytes who recognised the transformed Jesus as 'son of Dōd,' *i.e.* as the Messiah. 'Ben-David' is a later substitute for 'Ben-Dōd.'

Bar-Jesus and Elymas (Acts xiii. 6).

It is surprising that no explanation is given of the name Bar-Jesus. Did the person so named claim to be, in a special sense, a 'son,' or disciple, of Jesus? But what had Jesus Christ in common with Bar-Jesus? The compiler certainly regards the latter as one of those false prophets who are wolves in sheep's clothing (Matt. vii. 15). We must, therefore, change our point of view. Many personal names consist of regionals; Bar invariably stands for 'Arāb. Bar-Jesus, therefore, stands for 'Arāb-Yarḥu-Asshur. This Jewish prophet and magician came of a family which had a traditional connexion with N. Arabia. This region was the home of magic and of unethical prophecy. It is even not impossible that Bar-Jesus himself came from N. Arabia.

Apparently Bar-Jesus had another name (Acts xiii. 8)—Elymas; we may consider this as a surname. The redactor volunteers the information that it is equivalent to Magos (magician, sorcerer). But how is this equation arrived at?

Acts ii. 9 may furnish an answer. The Elamites there mentioned are, not sojourning Jews from the familiar Elam, but have come to Jerusalem from 'the other Elam,' or rather 'the Ashḥurite Elam,' in N. Arabia (Acts ii. 9; see p. 151). Now, N. Arabia was, as we have seen, the centre of false religion. Elymas, therefore,

is to be taken as = Ἡλαμείτης. Can we possibly evade this solution of the problem? עילם, of course, like יעלם, = ירחמאל.

Barnabas (Acts iv. 36).

'And Joseph, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is, being interpreted, Son of exhortation).' Either the apostles or the redactor may have identified this Joseph with Barnabas. At any rate, Barnabas looks like one of the names which the religious leaders of the early Christian community found in the list of the exiles who 'returned' from N. Arabia. 'Barnabas' is a corruption of 'Arab-Ishmael,' 'Ishmaelite Arabia,' the intermediate form being Rab-sanibu (we find Sanibu in Assyrian inscriptions as the name of an Ammonite king).[1] There is no trace of Babylonian religious influence in this innocent name.

It is important to notice again (see p. 13), in passing, how often Semitic epigraphy is helped by a keener criticism of the Biblical names. Bar-Nebo, for instance, in a Palmyrene inscription,[2] and Βαρνεβοῦς in a N. Syrian inscription, are best explained as coming from 'Arāb-Nebo; Nebo-bad (-bar) in like manner comes from Nebo-'Arāb.[3]

[1] In this intermediate form two points may strike us, viz. *n* for *m*, which is so common and natural as to need no defence, and *bu* for *bul*, for which compare בועז for עובל. See also *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 135.

[2] See *E. Bib.* col. 485 (with n. 1); Cooke, *North Semitic Inscr.* p. 187.

[3] *Ibid.*

It should also be noted that in Neh. vii. 33 (rev. text) we hear of an 'Ashḥurite Nebo.' Now Nebo comes from Shanbul = Shambul.

Barsabbas (Acts i. 23).

To Prof. Schmiedel[1] the name Barsabbas (so Westcott-Hort) suggests the meaning 'child of the Sabbath'; cp. the name Shabbethai (p. 34). The comparison is plausible; but both names are not free from suspicion. Shabbethai should probably be Shib'athi; the double *b* makes up for the elided ע. Similarly Sabbas in the former name might be from שבעתא or שבעת. The name is difficult. I prefer to regard it as a contraction from Ishpal (a form of Ishmael); here again the double *b* makes up for the contraction. בר comes from ערב; the evidence is absolutely overwhelming.

[1] *E. Bib.*, 'Barsabas or Barsabbas.'

CHAPTER VI

APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN

It is hardly possible to avoid seeing that the great Christian Apocalypse is based upon a Jewish work; indeed, that possibly more than one Jewish record has passed, after due adjustment, into the Christian. It appears to me to be also probable that some of the Christian portions of the Johannine Apocalypse had originally a different geographical background. The letters to the Seven Churches, for instance, were not perhaps originally addressed to seven Christian communities in Asia Minor, but to the same number in N. Arabia. The original names are no longer fully recoverable, except that Sepharad may underlie Sardis, and ʿArāb-Gomer (Rab-Mag) may lurk behind Pergamon. It is plausible, however, to suppose that, as in Acts ii. and 1 Pet. i., the names of churches addressed were suggested by the N. Arabian Christian communities. This appears to fit in with the circumstances of those communities so far as we can form some probable idea of them. If so, we should in all probability in Rev.

i. 9 restore 'Arāb-Pathros for 'the isle (אי from ערב = אבה = אבי, as often) that is called Patmos.'

Two passages in the Johannine letters may be specially appealed to in behalf of this theory. One is a passage relative to the N. Arabian soothsayer Balaam (Rev. ii. 14), and the other (Rev. ii. 20) to a too seductive woman, 'who calleth herself a prophetess, and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols.' No doubt, wherever any form of soothsaying prevailed, a Jewish writer might refer its origin to its typical ancient representative.[1] Still there would be a greater appropriateness in doing so in a writing addressed to residents in N. Arabia than to one inscribed, 'To the church in Thyatira.'

The other passage too receives fresh light from the N. Arabian theory, for the name of the seductive false prophetess is 'Izebel. This, of course, is a historical name. But its historical bearer certainly did not claim to be a prophetess. 'Izebel, therefore, is not a mere opprobrious nickname, but has a special significance to N. Arabian false prophets. איזבל comes from אביזבל, *i.e.* ערבזבל. The name here given to the head of the false prophets indicates that that prophetess herself and her methods of procedure reached the Jewish Christians from outside, *i.e.* from the ancient N. Arabian paganism.

[1] *Two Religions*, pp. 85-89.

There are also five passages in which the hand of the Greek-writing redactor may probably be traced.

1. Rev. ix. 14, xvi. 12, where 'the great river, the Euphrates,' was originally, perhaps, 'the stream of Gilead, the stream (called) Perāth.'[1]

2. Rev. xvi. 16, 'And they gathered them together into the place which is called in Hebrew Har Magedon.' Formerly I may have thought it enough to say that the mountains in mythical geography could not be localized. But though this statement may be true, the ancients could not be withheld from localizing them. Har Magedon is, from our present point of view, a corruption of Har Gamron, which means the highland region in which the Gamrite (= Garmite, 1 Chr. xxvi. 11) clan was settled.[2] Was this the mountain range (= Ḥermon) on which the fallen angels descended? Or that (= Ashtar) on which Noah's Ark grounded? At any rate, N. Arabia has, I think, been shown to be the region in which the heroes of Genesis met their more than human visitors. And the Apocalypse is the story of the New Genesis. I will add that Gog and Magog, mentioned in Rev. xx. 8, as 'in the four corners of the earth,' are by our best authority (Ezek. xxxviii.-xxxix.) closely connected with N. Arabia,

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 262 *f.*

[2] See p. 20; *D. and F.* p. 18. But see *E. Bib.*, 'Armageddon.'

so that ארץ, as often, should be rendered 'land,' *i.e.* N. Arabia and Judah.[1]

3. Βαβύλων (xvii. 1-6). Almost all the O.T. passages in which בבל occurs refer to North Arabia.[2] It is probable, in my opinion, that the Babel spoken of here was, in the original text, also in North Arabia; בָּבֶל הָרִבָּה should be בבל הָעֲרָב, Arabian Babel. Unrepentant dwellers in this Babel shall have no access to the New Jerusalem; 'without are the Rakbulites,[3] and the sorcerers, and the fornicators' (Rev. xxii. 15).

4. Rev. xiii. 18, 'Here is wisdom. He that hath understanding, let him count the number of the beast; indeed, it is the number of Ishmael, and his number is Six hundred and sixty and six' (or 'Six hundred and sixteen'). It is true, the Greek translation has, not 'the number of Ishmael,' but 'the number of a man'; but the parallel of xxi. 17, where an explanatory gloss is inserted,[4] seems to me to make all clear; *'enosh* is, in fact, like *sha'on*, a corruption of Shim'on (= Ishmael).[5] 'The number of Ishmael' is the mode of calculation, *gematria*, in special vogue in Ishmaelite Arabia, just as, in xxi. 17, 'the measure of Ishmael (or Yeraḥme'el)' means the measure in use among the N. Arabian merchants. And what originally

[1] See *T. and B.* pp. 157 *f.* [2] *Ibid.* pp. 187 *f.*

[3] See *Mines of Isaiah*, pp. 86, 137.

[4] In Rev. xxi. 17 (restored Hebrew text) *'enōsh* is glossed by *mal'ak*, which, however, is based on a corruption of *Yeraḥme'el*.

[5] For other parallels see *Mines of Isaiah*, p. 156 (n. 1).

was the signification of the Ishmael-number? Surely not 'Nero Kaisar,' but 'Ashḥur-Ramman.' In xvii. 5, 'Mystery, Babel *of Arabia*,' is parallel. 'Asshur-Yeraḥme'el' had been deposed, but was still the royal consort of Babel.

5. Rev. xvii. 9, 'Here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth,' etc. Not that the N. Arabian Babel was really planted on seven mountains, or that a great harlot really sat enthroned beside 'many waters' (*vv.* 1, 17). It is all mythological. The 'great harlot' is a goddess, and the mountains and 'many waters' came down from heaven;[1] they belong to what may truly be called eschatological geography. The symbols do not always appeal to us, but, on the whole, how grand is the fusion of divers elements! Would that we could read it in its original form and share the author's understanding of his recondite symbols!

The interpretative function I cheerfully resign to Dr. R. H. Charles, in the hope that some of the four keys will gain due recognition. One of these is the later Jewish literature; another is the textual methods applied by myself; a third is the comparison of Babylonian religious records, and a fourth that of the earlier and later Zoroastrian literature. The last of them, I was, I believe, the first to apply critically, in a book

[1] *T. and B.* pp. 83 *f.*

called *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter.* The eschatology of the Johannine Apocalypse, so Zoroastrian in its symbols, specially attracted me. I would fain resume the task. Failing this, I would lay it upon the consciences of my younger colleagues to determine whether they are making the most use that they could of what I have offered them. To have recovered so many lost facts is surely no paltry title to respect. It is not yet too late to comfort me in my sorrows by greater fairness and generosity. *Forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.* But who shall interpret *olim*?

INDEX

I. SUBJECT MATTER

The Poem of Indian origin which follows the Dedication will have made it plain to the reader why the author is incomplete in his Index. No work is more irksome than index-making, but an imperfect Index may be of no slight worth to the user of the book.

'*Abar-naharâ*, 21, 26
Abbott, E. A., 146-7, 161
Abomination of desolation, 111 *f.*
Abrahamic peoples, ambitions of, 133
Achior, 106 *ff.*
Agabus, prophet, 145
Agagi, title of Haman, 66
Ah'ab, Akab, 27, 49, 66, 113, 145
Ahasuerus, 24
Ahava, a stream, 28
Aḥikar, 70
Alphæus, 159
Amalim = N. Arabians, xvii, 7
Ammonite explained, 18
Andrew, 156
Apocalypse, based on Jewish works, 167
  its Zoroastrian affinities, 172
Apostles, names of, 154 *ff.*
Arioch, 113
Armageddon (Har Gamron), 169
Artaxerxes, 19
Aryan elements in O.T. (?), 65 *ff.*
Ashtart, goddess of love, 74
  her festival, 60
  her titles, 34, 74, 83, 112, 146
Asmodæus, demon, 98 *ff.*
Asnappar, 19
Ašurbanipal, 49

Bābel, the name explained, 7
  in N. Arabia, 153, 170
Bagoas, 110, 145
Balaam, 168
Bar-abbas, explained, 161 *ff.*
  origin of story, 162
Bar-Jesus, 164. *See* Elymas
Bar-nabas, 165
Bar-sabbas, 166
Bartholomew, 158
Bartimæus, 163
Baruch, First, 119 *f.*
Ben-hadad, 158 (*n.* [1])
Benjamin, 158 (*n.* [1])
Bertholet, Alf., 58
Bethany, 145-7
Bethel, explained, 9
  antiquity of name, 9
Beth-lehem, 132, 140 *ff.*
Beth-phage, 146
Bethulia, 108 *f.*
Bezetha, 147
Boanerges, 156
Border-streams, southern, 29
Bousset, W., 80 (*n.* [1])
Burkitt, F. C., 137
Burney, C. F., 29 (*n.* [2])

Cannon, W. W., 76 *f.*
Casiphia, 31
Charles, R. H., 171
Chorazin, 139
Chronicler, the, 3, 46
Cook, S. A., 42, 108 *f.*, 159
Cooke, G. A., 12 *f.*, 13 (*n.* [2]), 77, 130 (*n.* [1]), 165 (*n.* [2])
Cowley, A. E., 108, 110
Cyrus, 11, 17 *f.*, 58

Daniel, Book of; N. Arabian background of first part, 114 *ff.*
Darius, 12 *f.*, 18

Dōd and Ben-Dōd, 128, 163 (*n.* 2)
Dothan, 109
Driver, S. R., 77

Elam, Elamites, in N. Arabia, 21, 52, 62, 131, 164
Elephantinê, Jews in, 9
Elymas, a soothsayer, 164 *f.*
Erbt, H., 79 (*n.* 2)
Esther, a romance, 65
its background, 68
its theme, 69
Ethbal, Ethmael, Ethmul, 17, 108 *f.*
Ezra, missioner of the law-book, 26
his journey from Bābel to Jerusalem, 28 *f.*

Gabbatha, 145
Gabriel, 96, 103
Galilee, southern, 136 *f.* and often
the mountain in, 148-150
Gamrite clan, 169
Gemoll, M., 141 (*n.* 1), 143
Gethsemane, 143 *f.*
Gilead, southern, 9, 84
God — names of the inner divine council, 80
heaven-gods, 11-14
Golgotha, 144 *f.*
Guthe, H., 16, 28, 33, 43 *f.*

Haggai, 7
Harris, Rendel, 95
Hermon, southern, 169
Herod and the Messiah, 135
Herodotus, 17
Hiram, craftsman, 13
Holofernes, 106

India, 69, 151
Israel, foreign influence on, 94

James (Jacob), 157
Jeroboam's mother, 161
Jerusalem, southern, 144, 150
Jeshua or Joshua, high priest, 8, 48
Jezebel, 168
Job, Book of, its relation to Aḥiḳar, 70
suggested by Babylon, 70
references to birds of prey, 72
John (Johanan), 157 *f.*
Johns, C. H. W., 48, 54, 57, 62
Judas Iscariot, 160
Judith, Book of, its object, 105
N. Arabian background, 105 *ff.*

Lebbæus, 159 *f.*
Levi, 159

Maccabee, origin of name, 113
Judas, the, 134
Maccabees, First, its N. Arabian basis, 112 *f.*
Madai, 85, 105 *f.*, 151
Magi, the underlying Hebrew, 133
Mamilch, Mount, 148
Marquart, I., 15 21, 24
Matthew, 159
Megabyzos, revolt of, 37
Messiah, the, in Balaam's oracle, 134
the suffering, 129
Meyer, Ed., 12, 15, 19-21, 26, 41, 49-51, 88
Mikael, 96 (*n.* 2), 103, 116 *f.*
Miṣrim, part of N. Arabia, 34, 52, 64, 94, 99, 117, 152, 161
Mordecai, 48 *f.*, 67 *f.*
Moulton, J. H., 65, 83, 87, 91, 100 (with *n.* 2), 133
Mountain-sanctuary in borderland, 108, 136 *ff.*

Nazareth, Nazarene, 136 *ff.*
Nebuchadnezzar, 68 *f.*, 105 (*n.* 1), 110 (*n.* 1)
Nehemiah, Book of, a historical romance, 36
Nehemiah, his extraction, 37
his office, 37
what does Tirshatha mean? 57
Nestle, Eberhard, 159
Nethinim, 30-32, 45, 53 *f.*
Nineveh, the underlying name, 84, 156
Nöldeke, Theod., 36, 37 (*n.* 1), 52, 55, 65, 67, 157

Oesterley, Dr., 111
Olives, Mount of, 150

Par'osh, impossible theory, 50, 130
Pathros, 11, 78 *f.*, 151, 163
Patmos, isle of, 168
Persian names disputed, 49 *ff.*
Peter, romance of his travels, 152 *f.*
his names, 155 *f.*
Philip, 158
Pur (Purim), 69
Purple from N. Arabia, 63

Rab-Mag, 20, 158 (*n.* 1), 167
Raphael, 97 *f.*, 100
Regem-Melek, 10

Reshef, Syro-Egyptian war-god, 129
Reṣin explained, 139 *f.*

Samaria, Samaritans. *See* Shimron, Shimronim
Sanballat, 38 *f.*, 45
Ṣarephath, 42, 49, 56, 113
Schmidt, N., 116
Schmiedel, P. W., 163
Sennacherib, 85
Shabbethai, 34 *f.*, 166
Shalmaneser, 85
Shenazzar, 15
Sheshbazzar, 15
Shethar-bozenai, 15 *f.*, 28 *f.*
Shimron, Shimronim, 22, 24
Simon Peter. *See* Peter
Simon the Cananæan, 160
Simon the Leper, 161
Simpson, D. C., 82 *ff.*
Smith, Prof. W. B., 136, 145, 163 (*n.* [2])
Song of Solomon—is it a drama? 74
or based on a popular Adonis-song? 74
place of its composition, 75 *ff.*
Stade, B., 29 (*n.* [2])

Tabeel, 19
Tattanai, 23
Thaddæus, 159 *f.*
Thomas, 159
Tigris in Tobit, 96
Tobiah, his ethnic connexion, 10, 39
son of Tobit, an Israelite, 97
his dog, 97, 100
Tobit, Book of, its varied culture, 82
Egyptian influence not traceable, 92
Hellenic detail about the dog, 97
Iranian elements exaggerated, 100
its ethical dependence on Aḥiḳar, 94
N. Arabian background, 96 *ff.*
interest in works of mercy, especially in the burial of bodies of dead Israelites, 85 *ff.*
Torrey, C. C., 3-6, 16 *f.*, 46 *f.*, 52, 58, 108 *f.*, 123

Valley of smiths, 51

Wellhausen, Jul., 49 *f.*, 76, 163
Winckler, Hugo, 15, 22, 31, 40
Wisdom, a N. Arabian product, 81
evidence in Prov. and Eccles., 78 *f.*

Yahwè, in one of his aspects a wise God, 103
the antithesis of the Evil Power, 102
Yeraḥme'el becomes the Evil Power, better known as Belial (Beliar) or Satan, 102
Yeraḥme'elites, their wisdom, 78; copied by Israelites, *ibid.*; included skill in cursing, 76
mysteries of their great God Yarḥam, 148
painted too darkly by prophets of Israel, 80

Zacchæus, 161
Zerubbabel, 7, 18

II. BIBLICAL REFERENCES, ETC.

Here, I confess, the pen refuses to follow the guiding will. The number of references is so great. I therefore beg the reader to mark with coloured pencil in the margin the most important references. There is much extracting of a supposed original text from under the superincumbent weight of Massoretic conjecture, but not too much. Prof. Marti would confine himself within the narrowest possible limits, but there is no mean between the Massoretic rewriting and the steady scientific restoration after which I have aimed. I do not despise the former; it gives what early scholars thought that the original writers would have said, had they survived; but for the history of religion the work I have done is surely indispensable. See, further, Introduction to the second edition of my *Psalter*. This is why I beg the student to take much trouble, and to mark and classify the corrections. But I trust I shall bear bravely whatever lot may be mine, even if this appeal to fellow-scholars should be in vain. Like Arjuna in one of the Indian epics, I shrink from contending with my friends. But the saying remains true—

> 'In the multitude of the sorrows which I have in my heart,
> Thy comforts have refreshed my soul.'

GENESIS
iv. 22, p. 8
xxxvi. 39, p. 15

JOSHUA
xviii. 23, p. 10

1 SAMUEL
x. 21, p. 15

1 KINGS
v. 4, p. 22

2 KINGS
xviii. 4, p. 8
xix. 12, p. 20

1 CHRONICLES
iv. 7, p. 8

EZRA
i. 3, p. 14
iii. 7, p. 17

NEHEMIAH
xi. 25-36, p. 61

1 ESDRAS
ii. 16, p. 20
iv. 42–v. 6, p. 12
vi. 12, p. 13
vi. 28, p. 14 (*n.* [1])
viii. 44, p. 31
ix. 34, p. 34
ix. 44, p. 59

2 ESDRAS
iv. 9, p. 20

JEREMIAH
v. 7, p. 146

EZEKIEL
xxvii. 12, p. 16

HOSEA
xii. 3, p. 46

JOEL
iv. 4, p. 17

ZECHARIAH
i. 8-11, p. 8
ii. 11, iv. 14, p. 7
ii. 12, p. 8
vi. 10, p. 9
v. 5-11, p. 99
xii. 11, p. 136

PSALMI SOLOMONIS
ii. 30, p. 99

ACTS
xiii. 6, p. 164

JOHANNINE APOCALYPSE
ii. 14, 20, p. 168
xiii. 18, p. 170
xvi. 12, 16, p. 169
xvii. 1-6, p. 170
xvii. 5, 9, p. 171
xx. 8, p. 169
xxi. 17, p. 170
xxii. 15, p. 170

THE END

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*

DATE DUE

THE KING'S INSTITUTE
THE CHURCH ON THE WAY

THE KING'S IN
THE CHURCH O

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000031546

4344